

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 15, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast put into our hearts a vision of a fair and beautiful civilization and Thou hast given to us the ultimate principles of such a civilization in the doctrines of the Man of Galilee, in the Golden Rule, in the Ten Commandments, in the great conception of the duty and responsibility of the strong to the weak. Thou dost send us forth with the doctrine and with the might of Thy law. We pray Thee to carry us on to conquest and victory and to the accomplishment of Thy will. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. MYERS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Henderson	Overman	Sutherland
Baird	Hitchcock	Owen	Swanson
Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	Phelan	Thomas
Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Thompson
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Poinexter	Tillman
Colt	Kellogg	Pomerene	Townsend
Culberson	King	Reed	Trammell
Curtis	McCumber	Shafroth	Underwood
Dillingham	McKellar	Sheppard	Vardaman
Fletcher	McLean	Sherman	Wadsworth
France	McNary	Shields	Walsh
Frelinghuysen	Martin	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Gerry	New	Smith, Mich.	Weeks
Hale	Norris	Smoot	Williams
Harding	Nugent	Sterling	Wolcott

Mr. GERRY. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] are detained by illness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent owing to illness.

Mr. BECKHAM. My colleague [Mr. JAMES] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

## ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 202).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$68,100 required for additional clerical force in the office of the Auditor for the War Department for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

## NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the governor of Maryland, transmitting a certified copy of joint resolution No. 1 of the General Assembly of Maryland, ratifying the proposed prohibition amendment to the Constitution, which will be read and placed on the files. The communication is as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
Annapolis, Md., March 12, 1918.

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As directed by joint resolution No. 1 of the General Assembly of Maryland of 1918 I transmit herewith certified copy of the same.

Very truly, yours,

EMERSON C. HARRINGTON,  
Governor of Maryland.

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

I, Emerson C. Harrington, governor of the State of Maryland and having control of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the following is a full, true, and correct copy of joint resolution No. 1 of the General Assembly of Maryland, passed at its January session, 1918.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be hereto affixed the great seal of the State of Maryland at Annapolis, Md., this 12th day of March, in the year 1918.

EMERSON C. HARRINGTON.

By the governor:  
[SEAL.]

THOS. W. SIMMONS,  
Secretary of State.

## Joint resolution No. 1.

Joint resolution of the House of Delegates and Senate of Maryland ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America proposed by Congress to the legislatures of the several States.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States as provided by the Constitution:

## "ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have the concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland:

SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of Maryland.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

HERBERT R. WOODEN,  
Speaker of the House of Delegates.  
PETER J. CAMPBELL,  
President of the Senate.

Approved March 12, 1918.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## Joint resolution 1 A.

Joint resolution relating to the privilege of sending mail without the payment of postage.

Whereas every person who is in the service of his country in the military or naval forces of the United States should be aided in retaining that close touch with the folks at home which means so much to them all; and

Whereas we are eager to give every assistance possible to those who are doing brave work at the front for us all; and

Whereas the cost of postage on mail matter is frequently of serious moment to those whose chief source of income has been taken away when a husband or son or brother has gone into the Army or Navy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin does respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may make it possible for mail matter from any person in the military or naval forces of the United States to be transmitted without the payment of postage thereon, under such reasonable restrictions as may be deemed necessary for protection.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Members from this State in the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

LAWRENCE C. WHITTET,  
Speaker of the Assembly.  
C. E. SHAFFER,  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.  
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,  
President of the Senate.  
O. G. MUNSON,  
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## Joint resolution No. 10 A.

Joint resolution relating to excess profits and war revenues.

Whereas industrial conditions in Wisconsin and throughout the United States have been fundamentally disturbed by the great world war; and

Whereas increased revenues must be raised with which to meet expenditures occasioned by the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we denounce as unpatriotic any effort to make undue profits out of the necessities of the people or the Government, and we heartily commend those business

men who have undertaken Government contracts on a cost basis, asking only those reasonable returns to which they are entitled in times of peace; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we call upon Congress to impose during the war such an increase in taxes on incomes, inheritances, and excess profits as shall reduce incomes to the amount just necessary to secure the requisite co-operation of the various factors in production—land, labor, capital, and talent; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the presiding officers and to each of the Senators and Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States.

LAWRENCE C. WHITTET,  
*Speaker of the Assembly.*  
C. E. SHAFFER,  
*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*  
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,  
*President of the Senate.*  
O. G. MUNSON,  
*Chief Clerk of the Senate.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**Joint resolution No. 9 A.**

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and Hon. Herbert Hoover to investigate into the situation confronting dairy farmers and to take the necessary steps to remedy such situation.

Whereas the conditions confronting the dairy farmers of this State who are producing milk for sale as commercial milk in cities of this and adjoining States and to condensaries is of a grave and serious nature, due especially to the unusually high cost of feed, labor, and other elements that enter into the cost of producing milk and to the prices that have been fixed for such milk by official commissions created therefore, which prices the farmers themselves and others eminently qualified to testify declare are below the actual cost of production; and

Whereas both the producer and consumer must suffer if these conditions are not remedied, for under the operation of nature's law the producer can not continue as such at a loss, and, if he can not produce, it follows that the supply for consumption must decrease. Therefore be it

*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States and Hon. Herbert Hoover, National Food Administrator, be, and they are hereby, respectfully memorialized to fully investigate into the situation hereinbefore referred to and to take steps as soon as may be possible to protect Wisconsin's greatest industry, namely, the dairy industry, by adjusting, so far as may be possible, the costs of feeds, the principal element entering into the cost of producing milk, and the prices that have been fixed as above stated, with a view to benefiting both consumer and producer of milk and to protecting Wisconsin's most important industry; be it further

*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be, and he is hereby, directed to forthwith forward a suitably engrossed copy of these resolutions to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Hon. Herbert Hoover, at Washington, D. C.

LAWRENCE C. WHITTET,  
*Speaker of the Assembly.*  
C. E. SHAFFER,  
*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*  
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,  
*President of the Senate.*  
O. G. MUNSON,  
*Chief Clerk of the Senate.*

Mr. BORAH. I present a petition of the Children of America Loyalty League, signed by several thousand children, asking that the Star-Spangled Banner be made the national hymn by law. I suppose the petition should be referred to the Committee on the Library, and I move its reference to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARDING. I send to the desk a number of petitions very extensively signed by citizens of Ohio asking for more drastic legislation in dealing with pro-German activities in this country. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Congress Heights, D. C., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Los Angeles County Medical Association, of California, praying for an advanced rank for officers of the Medical Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McNARY (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) presented a petition of the Congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Primville, Oreg., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HALE. I present a petition signed by a committee of citizens of Warren, Me., praying for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of beer for the period of the war, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARREN, ME., March 3, 1918.

To the Hon. FREDERICK HALE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We, the attendants at the services of the Warren Baptist Church, Warren, Me., Lord's Day, March 3, 1918, believing that only by the most careful conservation of food, fuel and man power can America and

her allies win the present war, and aware of the fact that all of these are being worse than wasted, to an alarming degree, through the manufacture and sale of beer, we therefore urge upon you, honorable sir, as Senator from our district, to use your utmost influence and at the earliest possible date to secure national prohibition of the manufacture and sale of beer for the duration of the war and for the period of reconstruction after the war is over.

JOHN E. EMBRINGHAM,  
L. C. PACKARD,  
H. W. PENDLETON,  
*Committee.*

Mr. HALE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lewiston, Me., praying for self-determination and independence of Lithuania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

**TOWN OF SEWARD, ALASKA.**

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Territories, to which was referred the bill (S. 4021) to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$25,000 for the purpose of constructing dikes, flumes, and other works to confine the waters of Lowell Creek for the protection of said town, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 313) thereon.

**BILLS INTRODUCED.**

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4107) to amend an act entitled "An act to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars from January 1, 1859, to January, 1891, inclusive, and for other purposes," passed and approved March 4, 1917; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4108) to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries; to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

A bill (S. 4109) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Commercial Pacific Cable Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN):

A bill (S. 4110) for the relief of John W. Baggott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 4111) granting an increase of pension to Henry Strouse;

A bill (S. 4112) granting an increase of pension to George W. Griffith;

A bill (S. 4113) granting a pension to Clarinda F. Pratt;

A bill (S. 4114) granting a pension to Mary M. Withrow; and

A bill (S. 4115) granting an increase of pension to James J. Winans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 4116) for the relief of Ann E. Griffith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4117) granting an increase of pension to James S. Moore (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4118) granting a pension to Florence M. Luro (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4119) granting an increase of pension to Elias B. Moore (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4120) granting an increase of pension to Warren Jones (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

**GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK, ARIZ.**

Mr. ASHURST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 390) to establish the Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

**PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.**

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed and the calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not see a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the Chamber.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am a member of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator if he desires to take up the Agricultural appropriation bill at this time?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am not aware of the wishes of the chairman of the committee. If the Senator from Utah has something that he wants to bring up now, I shall not object.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no particular measure to call up unless it would be Senate bill 3783, but I will say that that is a general pension bill and I know it can not be passed between now and 2 o'clock. Therefore, I shall not move to take up the bill at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then, I ask that the Agricultural appropriation bill be taken up and proceeded with.



Mr. GALLINGER. Just one word. I will ask the Senator from Utah if there is not an omnibus pension bill on the calendar?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will say to the Senator the Committee on Pensions has not taken up the House bill, but there are two Senate omnibus pension bills on the calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think we might take them up. I make that suggestion, to fill in a little gap, if agreeable to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I withdraw the request.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider Senate bill 3799.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3799) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

It proposes to place on the pension roll at the rates named the following persons:

Melvina Coquillard, widow of James Coquillard, late captain Company E, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$25, the same to be paid her without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

Henry Wenzel, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel S. Wilson, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Leadbeater, late of Company E, Two hundred and fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel H. Brooks, late of Company I, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Bass, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$27 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles E. Wilcox, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company B, Ninety-second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Adam Eckert, late of Company H, Third Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert Boon, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert S. Greene, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Burns, late of U. S. S. *Potomac* and *Horace Beals*, United States Navy, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Robert Liddell, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Amos Dickinson, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry A. Dayton, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Theodore C. Bates, late of Company F, Second Battalion, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Marks, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alexander Reed, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William L. Swiger, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas J. Denny, late of Company M, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Grigg, late of Company D, Fifty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William L. V. Kite, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel B. Mills, late of Company E, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William O'Callaghan, late of U. S. S. *Fahkee*, United States Navy, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Wones, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frederick S. Webber, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Bat*, and *Hornet*, United States Navy, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jerome McWethy, late of Company G, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary L. King, widow of Josias R. King, late lieutenant colonel Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James Campbell, late of Company K, Fortieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward Patrick, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$27 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Wyckoff, late of Company I, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hugh S. Ryan, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harvey Johnson, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Myron Gillmore, late of Company B, Ninety-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Marion A. Babcock, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin F. Brock, late of Company G, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Loreta Blevins, widow of Dillion Blevins, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, \$37 in lieu of that she is now receiving; and that in the event of the death of Robert T. C. Blevins, helpless and dependent child of Dillion Blevins, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine; and that in the event of the death of Loreta Blevins the name of Robert T. C. Blevins shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 from and after the date of the death of Loreta Blevins.

Hannah McAdams, widow of Patrick McAdams, late sergeant major, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$12.

Ferdinand Fetter, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Hoyt, late of U. S. S. *Silver Lake* and *Red Rover*, United States Navy, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John B. Donaldson, late of Third Independent Battery Iowa Volunteer Light Artillery, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John E. Clark, late of Company C, First Regiment Alabama and Tennessee Independent Vidette Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Patterson, late first lieutenant Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Clifford A. Lewis, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Georgianna Thomas, widow of Jacob Thomas, alias Jacob Doutha, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, \$25 in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Thomas J. Gafford, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah J. Briles, former widow of Noah W. Briles, late of Company I, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, \$25.

John A. Wise, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rosa Flake, widow of Levi Flake, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, \$25.

John M. Holmes, late of Company F, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John E. Rogers, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment, and Company G, Thirty-second Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William S. Reed, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Augustus A. Clawson, late of Company A, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Wesley B. Reed, late of Company A, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Homer E. Benton, late of Company B, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Milton Laird, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nathan H. Ellis, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Walter E. Ellis, helpless and dependent son of Walter B. Ellis, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$12.

George Engleman, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas V. Malone, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$27 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Flagg, late of Company F, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert H. Wood, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas McCarty, late of Company L, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry J. Edge, alias Jason Edge, late of U. S. S. *Benton*, United States Navy, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew West, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment, and Company D, Tenth Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William A. Bodine, late of Company I, Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George D. Abraham, late of Company I, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Uriah G. Williams, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$27 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John C. Emery, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and assistant surgeon, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$21 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Tripp, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alonzo Pendland, late unassigned, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$21 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas M. Johnson, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment, Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James S. Gray, late of Company B, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaac Wharton, late of Company H, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Increase E. Watson, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mark Whitney, late musician, band, Thirteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Stokes, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Melville N. Freeman, late of Company D, Third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George C. Bonney, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Algen S. Leach, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William W. Findley, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Curles, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Wells, late of Company E, Sixty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Derrick Huck, late of Company A, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Seth Bailey, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Abbie L. Lockwood, widow of Horace H. Lockwood, late of Company D, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and First Independent Company Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, \$20.

Ivin M. Hill, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. McMillen, late of Company B, McLaughlin's squadron, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Bradford G. Ostrander, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William A. Reeves, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Fred Eneker, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Booth, late second lieutenant Company C, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Campbell, late of Company D, First Battalion, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William W. Daniels, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Behre, late musician, band, general service, United States Army, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles F. Runyan, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John H. Denny, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin F. Sage, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Watkin H. Jones, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James Cummins, late of Company E, Eighty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George G. Laughead, late of U. S. S. *Ouachita*, United States Navy, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Scott Thompson, late of U. S. S. *General Lyon* and *Great Western*, United States Navy, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel C. Howe, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David I. Hain, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph T. Lewis, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lafayette Fasnaugh, late of Company E, Fifty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$18.

John V. Reed, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James M. Shuey, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harry M. Sherman, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Thomas, late of Company E, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William J. Seals, late of Company D, Second Regiment East Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alexander D. Smalley, late of Battery F, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emery O. Pendleton, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Esburn Nutt, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Freeman D. Myrick, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment, and Company K, Thirtieth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Moses F. Hurd, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William L. Hayden, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel McClure, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.



Henry McClure, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Michael O. Sullivan, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Patrick Walton, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company D, Thirteenth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Francis Mathews, late of U. S. S. *Michigan*, *John Adams*, and *Santee*, United States Navy, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Amariah K. Wheeler, late of Company E, Coast Guards, Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$27 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas J. Hargrave, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George O. Pearl, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ina L. Murdock, helpless and dependent child of George W. Murdock, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$12.

Daniel W. Shawhan, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry T. Snyder, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George H. Fogg, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Lee Anderson, late major and brevet lieutenant colonel One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Openchain, late of Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Seward Newton, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaiah P. Watts, late of Company H, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward Sams, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas G. Davison, late of Company G, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nancy Hackleman, dependent mother of Isaac Hackleman, late of Company L, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John L. Rushton, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles W. Wormell, late of the Seventh Battery, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sylvanus Smith, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Hall, late first lieutenant, Company D, Twelfth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Gilbert, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

McHenry Smith, late of Company H, Eightieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Acton, late of Company C, Seventh Battalion, District of Columbia Militia Infantry, \$21.

Adrian J. Hayward, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emma A. Hoskins, widow of Thomas D. Hoskins, late of Company A, Thirty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Marvin Norris, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$20.

George W. Thompson, late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Milton N. Campbell, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaac N. Stotts, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Woodward, late of Company D, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Richard B. Daniels, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas Day, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jared Wheeler, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George B. Gilbert, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John H. Annas, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Delos Neer, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Murray, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel H. Pettengill, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Josiah C. Tandy, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Addison S. Martin, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James Churchill, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas Percival, late of Company K, First Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Martin, late of Company K, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Angus C. Burns, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Cornelius McGoff, late of Company D, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Nathaniel Wilt, late of Company B, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Smith, late of the U. S. S. *Vanderbilt*, United States Navy, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Theodore M. Burge, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Carrie M. Smart, helpless and dependent daughter of William M. Smart, late of Company K, Fifty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$12.

Hiram B. Newlon, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John F. Brainard, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaac D. Rowden, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edwin E. Baker, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Enos S. Whitcomb, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Chester R. Smith, late of Company K, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Horatio P. Smith, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Franklin Venable, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Capshaw, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, \$27 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James H. Fontaine, late of Company B, Third Regiment, and Company K, Sixth Regiment, Missouri State Militia Cavalry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas Fulkerson, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Michael H. Skinner, late of Company D, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Artillery, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William J. Smith, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, Eighty-fifth Regiment,

and Company H, Thirty-third Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John H. Bird, late of Company A, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William White, late of Company G, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph P. Case, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$27 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Washington Richardson, late of Company K, One hundred and ninth Regiment, and Company F, Eleventh Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James Stuart, late of Capt. Ahl's Independent Battery, Delaware Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edwin S. Metcalf, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Daniel Vanscoy, late of Company E, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Luther L. Rewalt, late assistant surgeon, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Margaret Dicks, former widow of Andrew Snyder, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and widow of James Dicks, late of Company F, Forty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$25.

Benjamin F. Morse, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James M. Widener, alias James W. Foster, late of Company I, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Isenberg, late of Company I, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas K. Hastings, late first lieutenant Company H, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William W. Thurston, late of Company I, Sixtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William W. Gordon, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Dewire, late of Company B, First Battalion, Nebraska Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James M. Millirons, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George L. Danforth, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Chester S. Pease, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$36 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John D. Swift, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Theodore Routh, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elisha D. Turner, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Arnold Bauer, late of Company B, Fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sylvester Oatman, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Imogen P. Ingersoll, widow of Charles T. Ingersoll, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Volunteer Infantry, \$25 in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Wilford Herrick, late unassigned, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Newell, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Ossipee*, and *Princeton*, United States Navy, \$40 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Crawford, late of U. S. S. *Princeton* and *Cornubia*, United States Navy, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lulu M. Joseph, widow of Mark Joseph, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Company L, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy

Artillery, \$37 in lieu of that she is now receiving. And that in the event of the death of Edith G. Joseph, helpless and dependent child of Mark Joseph, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine. And that in the event of the death of Lulu M. Joseph the name of Edith G. Joseph shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12, from and after the date of death of Lulu M. Joseph.

Charles D. Hanscom, late of Company I, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$50 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the present consideration of Senate bill 3798.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3798) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

It proposes to place on the pension roll at the rates named the following persons:

Abel H. Hall, late of Company F, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$17.

Frankie Esselstyn, widow of Elton H. Esselstyn, late of Company L, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$25, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Elton H. Esselstyn until they reach the age of 16 years.

Samuel Breitigan, late of U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, \$12.

Edward Sweeney, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, \$12.

Arthur Rose, late of Company L, First Regiment Washington Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12.

Lucie Kellogg, widow of William R. Kellogg, late of Troop A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, \$25.

William P. Robinson, late of Company I, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12.

William D. Harrington, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, \$12.

Fannie H. Maffitt, widow of John W. Maffitt, late of Company A, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$25.

Minnie H. Wolf, widow of Herman P. Wolf, late of Company H, First Regiment North Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$25, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Herman P. Wolf until they reach the age of 16 years.

Willis S. Harris, alias Charles E. Sanders, late of Battery C, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, \$12.

John M. Dikes, late of Troop H, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and Company A, Thirtieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James W. McKay, late first lieutenant Battery A, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, \$30.

Adam S. Bridgefarmer, late of Capt. Hiram Wilber's Company B, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles H. Ferriss, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, \$12.

Van Ogle, late first lieutenant, Company B, Washington Territory Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Reuben Waller, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas M. Woods, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George M. Spencer, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, \$17 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Katharine E. Bocoskey, widow of Michael Bocoskey, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, \$25 and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Michael Bocoskey until they reach the age of 16 years.



Thomas S. Millikin, late of Company L, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$17 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William C. Campbell, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, \$12.

William J. La Rock, late of Company C, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Forty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12.

Allen Russell, late of Capt. Standage's Cavalry company, Navajo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian War, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Oscar M. Dreilbeliss, late of Company M, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12.

Edmund G. Thompson, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph W. Gay, late of Capt. O. Humason's company B, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emmett W. Fitzsimmons, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$17.

Charles E. Matthews, late of Company A, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12.

Martha R. Sutton, widow of Thomas J. Sutton, late of Capt. John F. Miller's company, Oregon Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, \$20 in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Hildur M. Phillips, widow of George W. Phillips, late chief gunner, with rank of ensign, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, \$25 in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said George W. Phillips until they reach the age of 16 years.

Joseph M. Love, late of Company I, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$16 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Leander Thomas, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$12.

Isaac F. Allen, late of Companies C and L, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, \$10.

James M. Fitch, late of Troop F, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, \$17.

John Ferris, late of United States ship *Ashuelot*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Esther Shields, former widow of Walter Rogers, late of General Mounted Service, United States Army, Regular Establishment, \$20.

Elizabeth K. Cottman, widow of Vincendon L. Cottman, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, \$50.

Francis J. Kearney, late of Troop B, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Simeon Ely, late first lieutenant Capt. Goodall's company Oregon Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, \$30 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John A. D. Tharp, late of the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, \$30.

Wesley H. Dick, late of Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$17 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Julia Burger, widow of Peter Burger, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Florida Seminole Indian wars, \$20 in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Leander Johnston, late of Company I, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Laura C. Slack, widow of William B. Slack, late second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, \$25 in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXTENSION OF SPUR TRACK IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will state to the Senator from Georgia that I made the request a few moments ago that the Agricultural appropriation bill be taken up, and I now renew my request.

Mr. POMERENE. Before that is done I want to ask the Senate to take up a bill reported by the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee with respect to the hospital switch. I do not believe there is any serious objection to it, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3476) to authorize the extension of a spur track or siding from the existing lines of railroad in the District of Columbia across First Street NE., between L and M Streets, to the buildings occupied by the field medical supply depot of the Army.

Mr. GALLINGER. When the Senator from Ohio asked a few days ago for the consideration of this bill, I suggested that I had communications from parties connected with Sibley Hospital and some people outside, even outside the District of Columbia, asserting that it would work great injury to the hospital, to the patients in the hospital, and so forth, and for that reason I was not prepared to have the bill considered. I have waited since then, and I have heard nothing from either the hospital or others interested in the hospital, and for that reason I shall not object to the consideration of the bill at present.

Mr. POMERENE. I may say that I was asked to bring this matter up yesterday, but in the absence of the chairman of the committee, who has been indisposed, I did not do so. I, too, I may say, have received protests similar to those suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, and at first I confess I was very greatly prejudiced against the bill. I have since gone out there and visited the place, as I know a number of other Senators who are on the District Committee also went out, and I am quite sure that it is not in the least going to interfere with the hospital. If it would, I would not ask that this bill be passed. I know these protests were presented by the very best people and in the utmost good faith, but I think they are simply mistaken in what they think will be the effect of it.

There is a double street car track which passes right in front of the hospital. It has on both sides of it large warehouses, another warehouse in front of it and between the location of the switch and the hospital, and there is also a large apartment house there. I am satisfied that this extension will not in the least disturb the patients in the hospital.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, my thought is that, inasmuch as this was adopted in the Senate—and, of course, the attention of the authorities and others interested in this temporary use must have been called to it—if the opposition continued in any violent form they would have communicated with us on the subject.

Mr. POMERENE. I think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. And I have not heard from any of them. Am I correct, I will ask the Senator from Ohio, in the thought that this is a temporary matter?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes. There has been an amendment prepared which will be presented to the Senate, which leaves the spur during the period of the war, and for a certain length of time thereafter. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3476) to authorize the extension of a spur track or siding from the existing lines of railroad in the District of Columbia across First Street NE., between L and M Streets, to the buildings occupied by the field medical supply depot of the Army.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, when the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] asked for the consideration of this bill the other evening, I made the statement that I had received hundreds of letters protesting against the building of this track. They all came from people who are interested in the Sibley Hospital. Since then I have asked the Director of the Bureau of Standards if they had made a direct examination into this subject, and I am in receipt of a communication from Dr. Stratton, the Director of the Bureau of Standards. In that letter he states:

In reply to your verbal inquiry of to-day as to the effect of your supply buildings upon the sounds and other disturbances made by the operation of rolling stock on the proposed sidetrack, I would state that in view of the fact that the proposed track would be surrounded on the south, north, and east by buildings, they would shield to a great extent adjacent buildings from sound on the proposed track. I am of the opinion that the noise from the main track with which the spur is connected would be greater than that caused by the operation of equipment on the spur itself.

I am asking one of our experts, Dr. P. H. Edwards, to investigate the situation.

I have a copy of that report of Dr. Edwards, which reads as follows:

After looking carefully over the ground where it is proposed to build a spur track to the field medical supply depot and the arrangements of surrounding buildings, I am convinced that there would be very little, if any, disturbance at the Sibley Hospital from the operation of cars on this spur. It seems quite evident that the western buildings of the depot would practically cut off the noise almost entirely, especially when two stories more are added to these buildings. In my opinion, the noise reaching the hospital would be insignificant compared with that coming from the street car line which runs directly past the hospital. It would probably also be less likely to cause disturbance at the hospital than that arising from the spur tracks going to several coal yards which are almost as near, and which have practically an uninterrupted passage for sound to the hospital.

This is signed by Preston H. Edwards, chief of acoustic section, Bureau of Standards. That being the case, Mr. President, I shall not object to the present consideration of the bill, because I know that great advantage will accrue from the construction of the track.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio permit an inquiry?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely want to refer to some of the statements in the letters from which the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has just read.

The first statement, that the noises from this track would be largely cut off on the north, south, and east, is not correct. I have gone down there personally and looked the situation over. The street car tracks over which these cars will pass run along what would be called an alley between two concrete buildings that have been constructed for the use of the Government, but those buildings do not come up above the engines that would carry the cars in there. As a matter of fact, so far as the noise of the whistles and similar noises are concerned, there would not be any obstruction north and south. There is a building to the west.

Then there is another suggestion made in one of the letters which the Senator from Utah has read—that if the building on the west is raised two stories the noise would be cut off. If that is done, why, of course, it would cut off those noises; but there is not any assurance that that will be done. There is some proposal to have it done, but there is no assurance that it will be done.

The conclusions in the letter with reference to the injury to the hospital, and so on, as general conclusions, I do not agree with; but I will say, Mr. President, while I have the floor, with the permission of the Senator from Ohio, that I have been very strongly opposed to this spur track going in there. I have opposed it every time the matter has been heretofore presented. It did not get anywhere in the committee until the war situation came up. Some of us insisted upon certain amendments to the bill, if we were to consent to its passage at all. A substitute has been prepared. I do not know that the substitute has been yet read to the Senate. Under that substitute this track will not be used for traffic generally, but will only be used for the handling of supplies of the medical department. It is also made very definite and very certain that it is purely temporary. The committee, I think, was unanimous that this should be made purely a temporary track and that it should be made certain that it will be removed when the emergency passes.

The committee have also provided that it must be done within six months from the termination of the war. Then, as a further protection to the hospital, we have insisted that the bill be so amended that this track can not be used except between the hours of 6 o'clock in the morning and 9 o'clock at night, unless some extreme emergency requires further use.

Mr. President, with those changes, I have not felt justified in opposing the bill. I am satisfied that there will be a minimum of inconvenience to the hospital. I would not myself measure the suffering that might come to inmates of that institution by money or by any expense to which the Government might be put, but it seems to me that with these limitations and restrictions and with the conditions as they are there, especially with the limitation as to the use of the track between the hours of 6 o'clock in the morning and 9 o'clock at night, there will not be any appreciable interference with the use of the hospital or any inconvenience brought to the patients. For those reasons I have not felt disposed to oppose the passage of the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President—

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator from Vermont will permit me a moment, I may say that I would be just as much opposed to making this a permanent switch as is the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones], but I think under the present conditions, we shall not be seriously inconveniencing the hospital or its inmates, and, all things considered, I really think that this bill in its modified form ought to pass.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President—

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I should like to state that I have been a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia for a good many years. In 1903 the legislation was adopted under which the present Union Station was constructed, and the Southern Railroad was brought into it through a tunnel under Capitol Hill, by which all grade crossings in the city were eliminated and by which all the railroads coming in from the North have been kept east of First Street NE. It was then understood, I think, by everybody interested in the improvement of the city of Washington, that such should be the policy of the

Government hereafter; that railroads should not be permitted to cross First Street and so invade the territory lying west of it. I have in my mind now three different occasions when the owners of property in the block involved under this bill and owners of other blocks lying immediately west of First Street NE. have sought legislation that would enable them to extend spur tracks from the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad to connect with proposed warehouses on these lots, but in every instance that legislation has been reported adversely, and until this time it never has been done.

At this time a large concrete storehouse has been erected. It is occupied by the Government, and the easterly end of that building is almost flush with First Street. Immediately across that street is a vacant lot, upon which spurs from the Baltimore & Ohio are located, and from which the Government is asking permission to build a spur over First Street which will immediately enter this concrete building, which, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] has described, has heavy walls but no roof.

It is claimed, and it appeared before the committee, that it would save the Government \$300 a day in expense if it could have trains run into this building, and not only that, but would enable them to ship goods expeditiously for exportation to our armies in France. For this reason the committee consider that it is a real necessity that such spur be constructed.

The committee thoroughly considered the other questions which have been referred to by the Senator from Washington, and a majority reached the conclusion that by having the trains operated only during daylight the noises would not seriously disturb the patients in Sibley Hospital, yet they did not want to break the precedent which has been established concerning the construction of tracks across First Street into that district, and they only reported this bill upon the understanding that it should not be accepted as a precedent for that kind of legislation. If Senators will examine the report by the committee which accompanies this bill they will see that the committee expressly call attention to the policy I have been discussing, and they end their report by saying:

The only reason the committee have for recommending the accompanying bill is that a war emergency exists which warrants it, that the structure is of temporary character, and its operation so guarded that it will not seriously disturb the patients in Sibley Hospital, and that the structure is to be removed and the street restored within six months after the termination of the war.

And further than that, in order that there may be no mistake about it, they lay the specific duty upon the Surgeon General of the United States Army to construct this track, and they also lay the duty upon him to remove the same and restore the street to its present condition immediately after the termination of the war.

In order that this understanding may go down in history, I will ask to have the report printed with my remarks in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report referred to is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3476) to authorize the extension of a spur track or siding from the existing lines of railroad in the District of Columbia across First Street NE., between L and M Streets, to the buildings occupied by the field medical supply depot of the Army, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it pass, with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That authority is hereby granted the Surgeon General of the United States Army to construct, maintain, and operate a temporary single-track overhead siding across First Street NE., between L and M Streets, to the building or buildings in square 673, occupied by the field medical supply depot of the Army:

*Provided*, That the siding herein authorized shall not extend westwardly beyond a point 569 feet and 9 inches east of the present site of Sibley Hospital or any of its buildings; and shall be limited to the use of the Medical Department of the United States Army; and within six months following the declaration of peace the Surgeon General shall cause said track to be entirely removed from the limits of said street and shall cause the aforesaid street to be restored to its condition prior to the construction of the siding without cost to the District of Columbia.

"The Surgeon General of the Army shall provide for the construction, maintenance, and removal of this siding as herein authorized and prescribed, and the costs thereof shall be defrayed from the appropriations for the Medical and Hospital Department of the United States Army:

*Provided further*, That said track shall be used only between the hours of 6 o'clock a. m. and 9 o'clock p. m. except in cases of extreme emergency."

The necessity for this legislation lies in the fact that the Government is occupying a large storehouse, between L and M Streets, and which abuts on First Street, as a depot for medical supplies. And in order to expeditiously ship such supplies to our Army in France the construction of the railroad spur mentioned in the bill seems to be a real necessity. Its construction will not only expedite such shipments, but it is estimated will reduce the cost of transportation from the storehouse to the shipping station about \$300 per day.



It will be noticed that the bill is so framed that the railroad spur provided for is to be built and entirely controlled by the Surgeon General of the Army and is to be removed and First Street restored to its former condition within six months after the close of the present war.

In this connection the committee desires to place itself upon record as being unanimously opposed to the extension of railroad tracks across First Street for any permanent purpose. They recognize and approve the policy adopted by the Government in 1903 when all of the railroads of the city were compelled to find a terminal in the Union Station and when it was determined that First Street NE. should thereafter become the western boundary of railway constructions.

Since that time several attempts have been made by owners of land west of First Street to procure permission to construct spur lines across such street to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, but in every instance such demands have been refused, and the committee are of the opinion that all such demands should be refused in the future.

The policy not to permit the construction of railroad spurs across First Street was well known in 1903 and has been maintained ever since. Upon the strength of this the city has had a growth eastward toward First Street which would not otherwise have occurred, and among the buildings constructed have been the Sibley Memorial Hospital, the Lucy Webb Hayes Training School, and the Montgomery Apartment House, all upon North Capitol Street, only a short distance away. The directors of these institutions, and other owners of property in the vicinity, vigorously and justly oppose the invasion of the territory between North Capitol Street and First Street by the railroads, and the committee are of the opinion that the Government is in spirit pledged to them to prevent the same.

The only reason the committee have for recommending the accompanying bill is that a war emergency exists which warrants it; that the structure is of temporary character and its operation so guarded that it will not seriously disturb the patients in Sibley Hospital; and that the structure is to be removed and the street restored within six months after the termination of the war.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator from Ohio permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. One remark of the Senator from Vermont recalls to my mind an ancient question which, it seems to me, is worthy of more than passing notice. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] referred to the fact that he was here when the Union Station program was made. I also happened to have been here at the same time. A good many years have gone by; even the Senator from Vermont has grown gray since then, to say nothing of myself, and I should like to inquire either of the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from Vermont why it is that the old and dilapidated buildings at the north and west of the Senate Office Building should be permitted to remain in their present unsightly state?

Mr. GALLINGER. I can answer that question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to hear the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. So far as I am concerned, I am quite willing that the Senator from Michigan shall be a committee of one to remove them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator from Ohio will give me authority—such paramount authority as seems to be so easily bestowed in this time of national distress—I think I might work off some of my surplus zeal and energy to good advantage, perhaps better than here, on some of those old and unsightly buildings. I think it is an outrage that those buildings should be permitted to be a blot upon the landscape around the Senate Office Building.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I can give the Senator from Michigan an answer which I believe will be accurate and will not lead to a discussion.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator mean that I am to be foreclosed by what he is to say?

Mr. GALLINGER. Not at all. I had much to do with the legislation which ended in the construction of the Union Station—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think the Senator was the father of that program.

Mr. GALLINGER. And with the elimination of grade crossings in the District of Columbia, which were an abomination, and the removal of which was a great triumph in connection with that legislation.

As I understand the matter, when the Government purchased the land between the Senate Office Building and the Union Station and some land opposite the Senate Office Building, a commission was appointed to appraise it. In fact, most of it was owned by private parties, but a portion of it was owned by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. That commission made a report, putting what I thought was a fair value upon that property, but some overzealous individual carried the matter to the President of the United States, and by some method, with which I am not exactly familiar, the commission was discharged and a new commission was created to again estimate the value of the property. That commission reported a considerably less amount in value than the first commission had done. The private-property holders—that property being held in the air so that they could not rent it and could not sell it under the circumstances—had to take the allowance made by the second commission; but

the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., which could afford to go into litigation, resisted it, saying that the amount allowed by the first commission was a fair amount and ought to have been granted without controversy. The matter is still in litigation, as I understand. I do not know why it should remain in litigation so long; the lawyers will know better about that than I do.

I noticed yesterday when coming down the avenue from the Union Station that one old building was being dismantled; and I had hoped that that was the beginning of the end of which the Senator from Michigan complains, because it is in the nature of an outrage that those old buildings should remain.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I saw the building in a dilapidated state, and I noticed the work of its removal ceased; and the probabilities are that in a much less attractive form than it was before it may be permitted to stand there. Now, as I understand, those buildings have already been acquired by the Government and are not concerned in the Baltimore & Ohio contention.

Mr. GALLINGER. If they are not, of course they ought to be immediately removed. There is no question about that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There are many unsightly buildings around the city of Washington, but it is inexcusable for the Government to leave such unsightly buildings right here in the very shadow of the Capitol.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Michigan is seeking information which many of us desire. I think I can give it. That is the visible evidence of Government ownership. It is proceeding as expeditiously as those experts generally do. I understand this new commission—I think I am correct in this—are getting \$20 a day as long as this enterprise known as the Plaza here is on foot. I predict it is going to last many years as an offense against the esthetic taste of Senators who look out of a window that way and an offense against landscape gardening. I predict it will be there many years.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. At that rate of compensation, I have not any doubt about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That authority is hereby granted the Surgeon General of the United States Army to construct, maintain, and operate a temporary single-track overhead siding across First Street NE. between L and M Streets, to the building or buildings in square 673 occupied by the Field Medical Supply Depot of the Army: *Provided*, That the siding herein authorized shall not extend westwardly beyond a point 569 feet and 9 inches east of the present site of Sibley Hospital or any of its buildings; and shall be limited to the use of the Medical Department of the United States Army; and within six months following the declaration of peace the Surgeon General shall cause said track to be entirely removed from the limits of said street and shall cause the aforesaid street to be restored to its condition prior to the construction of the siding without cost to the District of Columbia.

The Surgeon General of the Army shall provide for the construction, maintenance, and removal of this siding as herein authorized and prescribed, and the costs thereof shall be defrayed from the appropriations for the Medical and Hospital Department of the United States Army: *Provided further*, That said track shall be used only between the hours of 6 o'clock antemeridian and 9 o'clock postmeridian except in cases of extreme emergency.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not noticed that any suggestion has been made along the line that I am going to interrogate the Senator from Ohio. Very likely I ought not to ask the question, but I have wondered whether anyone has taken into consideration the advisability of constructing an electric road covering this short distance.

Mr. POMERENE. I can not answer the Senator; I do not know.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me that that would obviate a great deal of noise, but I have not noticed that anybody has made the suggestion. It just occurred to me that it might have been a better method than to put in a steam railroad.

Mr. POMERENE. I may say I was not able to be present at all the hearings on this subject, and the suggestion was not made in my presence, at least.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I received a great many protests against this legislation. I do not know whether the officers of Sibley Hospital have acquiesced in the legislation or not. May I ask the Senator from Ohio whether there is any objection to the legislation by the officers of Sibley Hospital?

Mr. POMERENE. There was at first by some of the officers. Perhaps the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] could

answer more fully as to the extent of those objections. A good many of them have been withdrawn, I understand. I do not mean to say by that that some of the authorities may not still continue their objections, but they were largely based upon the theory that it was going to be a very serious inconvenience to this hospital. If Senators were to visit that site, as I and a number of my colleagues on the committee have done, I am sure they would be firmly of the opinion that, to say the least of it, it would not be very much inconvenience. I am confident that there will not be as much noise from the moving of those cars as there is every few minutes from the passing of street cars in front of the hospital and between the hospital and the end of the spur.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will yield, being a member of the committee I have made some investigation. I want to say to the Senator there are a great many very large trucks being employed now in hauling from the station to this depot the large supplies which the Government daily is bringing into the city. Those trucks, running constantly almost day and night, cause considerable noise. In my opinion, after having examined the subject very carefully, there will be less noise from the operation of the trains than there is now from the operation of the large number of trucks employed by the Government.

Mr. GRONNA. I understand it is suggested by the War Department that this track shall be built, and that it will be a saving to the Government of a great deal of money.

Mr. POMERENE. Three hundred dollars a day.

Mr. GRONNA. It will be only temporary; it will be only during the war. Of course, on the statement of both Senators that it will not seriously disturb this institution, I shall not object to the passage of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. While I do not think it would have any binding force and be merely a suggestion, I have observed that the men who run railroad trains like to make as much noise as possible and to blow the whistle on every possible occasion. They seem to seek an opportunity to blow the whistle.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And automobiles.

Mr. GALLINGER. As the Senator from Michigan suggests, the men who run automobiles are quite in the habit of letting the general public know that they are in evidence. I will ask the Senator from Ohio if he would have any objection to add at the end of the amendment, on page 3, the words "and the trains shall be operated with the least possible noise"?

Mr. POMERENE. I have no objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a mere suggestion. It is all it amounts to.

Mr. POMERENE. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the amendment of the committee the following words: "and the trains shall be operated with the least possible noise."

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I objected to the consideration of this bill on Saturday in order that the Sibley Hospital staff and every other person who is interested in the matter might have full opportunity to be heard. Some days have intervened, and I suppose everybody who is really interested in it has made such representations as he saw fit; and the Committee on the District of Columbia having investigated the matter, I do not care to assume the responsibility of undertaking to prevent the passage of the bill.

But I should like to make one observation in regard to it. There is a much more important question involved, I think, in the bill than the particular railroad switch that it authorizes or the interests of Sibley Hospital, because it involves all hospitals in all portions of the city—at least, in the section where the switch is to be located. It is just a question as to where you are going to lay the railroad track in that part of the town. There was a more or less well-defined understanding, according to the opinion of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], who, being for so many years on the District Committee, is familiar with these matters, that that line should be First Street NE.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Northwest.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Northeast. I think I am correct in saying northeast. The Army Medical Corps knew that when they located this warehouse on the west side of that street. Somebody else may come along and locate a warehouse a block still farther west, and come in here and say that it costs the Government \$400 a day, and it may cost the Government \$400 or \$500 a day if some one chooses to exercise the same sort of judgment in the location of this warehouse in locating warehouses in the future in the prohibitive area west of that street, where it

is not supposed the railroad track is going to go. There is plenty of area east of this street where a warehouse could be located, and that it is a violation of that general understanding and the insidious encroachment, little by little, bit by bit, upon the section of the city that was intended to be protected from noise and activities of railway transportation that constitutes the vice of this bill in my judgment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL-BANK ACT.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk Senate bill 4009 with a favorable report from the Committee on Banking and Currency, amending section 5200 of the national-bank act in such a way as to add these words:

*And provided further*, That any note or notes purchased or discounted by any such association to not exceeding one-half of the capital and surplus of such association, secured by the face value of such note or notes in bonds of the United States issued since April 24, 1917, or certificate of indebtedness of the United States, shall not be considered as money borrowed within the meaning of this section.

The effect of this is to permit national banks to lend on notes secured by liberty bonds or Treasury certificates issued during the war up to 50 per cent of their capital. The bill has the approval of the committee unanimously.

Mr. KNOX. May I inquire if it is 50 per cent of the capital or 50 per cent of the capital and surplus?

Mr. OWEN. Fifty per cent of the capital and surplus.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The bill (S. 4009) to amend and reenact section 5200, Revised Statutes of the United States, was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 5200, Revised Statutes of the United States, be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 5200. The total liabilities to any association, of any person, or of any company, corporation, or firm for money borrowed, including in the liabilities of a company or firm the liabilities of the several members thereof, shall at no time exceed one-tenth part of the amount of the capital stock of such association actually paid in and unimpaired and one-tenth part of its unimpaired surplus fund: *Provided, however*, That the total of such liabilities shall in no event exceed 30 per cent of the capital stock of the association. But the discount of bills of exchange drawn in good faith against actually existing values and the discount of commercial or business paper actually owned by the person negotiating the same shall not be considered as money borrowed: *And provided further*, That any note or notes purchased or discounted by any such association to not exceeding one-half of the capital and surplus of such association, secured by the face value of such note or notes in bonds of the United States issued since April 24, 1917, or certificate of indebtedness of the United States, shall not be considered as money borrowed within the meaning of this section."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If I understood the Senator, this is an amendment to the national bank act?

Mr. OWEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Not the Federal reserve bank act?

Mr. OWEN. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Therefore it can only deal with national banks?

Mr. OWEN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is the Agricultural appropriation bill before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I renew my request that the Agricultural appropriation bill be laid before the Senate and proceeded with. The chairman of the committee is now here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the so-called Borland amendment is under consideration, as I understand it, at the present time. I want to occupy the attention of the Senate a few minutes in submitting some observations concerning that provision.



Mr. President, so far as the public service is concerned, there is an equality of opportunity but not an equality of efficiency, and because of that fact it is a very difficult matter to legislate on the salary of employees of the Government. One clerk has 100 per cent efficiency, another clerk has 50 per cent or less of efficiency, and yet in any legislation that has been adopted or can be adopted we wipe out that difference in efficiency and give the inefficient clerk of necessity the same salary that the efficient clerk gets. It is unfortunate that it is so. I know clerks who in my judgment are underpaid and greatly underpaid. Some of the higher grades, men and women who are getting larger salaries than the mass of the clerks, are greatly underpaid because of their great efficiency as experts or statisticians, being men and women who have made a special study of the subjects that they handle. I know clerks who are vastly overpaid. On the other hand, the mass of clerks who have been brought into the District of Columbia recently are in my judgment paid twice what they are worth. Some of them will become efficient, some of them may reach the point of 90 or 100 per cent efficiency after a while, but some of them never can in the very nature of things earn the salary that is given them at the present moment. But, as I have already said, that is the chief difficulty in legislating on this subject. In an effort to do equal and exact justice to all, it is impossible of accomplishment, so we have got to do the best we can under existing conditions.

I will not stop to discuss the question whether the clerical force in the departments in Washington are paid more or less than is paid in outside establishments and in outside activities. My opinion is that they are paid a little more liberally, but that perhaps might be controverted, and at best it is immaterial.

In the last session of Congress we increased the salaries of the clerks, in some instances 5 per cent and in others 10 per cent. I favored that, and I understand that a proposition is now before the other House—which will doubtless reach the Senate in due time—and which, if enacted, as it probably will be, will still further increase the salaries of clerks who are getting somewhere from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per annum. I think that ought to be done. The condition surrounding not only the clerks but people in general, so far as the cost of living is concerned, is so abnormal that we ought not to stick in the bark when it comes to taking a little of the money of the taxpayers to see that the employees of the Government are at least provided with the necessities of life to an extent that will make them comfortable.

But, Mr. President, so far as the Borland amendment is concerned, I confess, after having given it pretty careful study, that it does not appeal to me as a wise way to legislate on this subject; certainly not unless it shall be amended. It provides simply that, so far as the appropriations made in this particular bill are concerned, no part of the money shall be used unless the clerks work eight hours per day. The statute that was read here yesterday, enacted in 1898, in a period of war, provides that they shall work seven hours a day and shall be subject to call on the part of the department heads, when an emergency requires it, to work longer hours, and presumably that system has been pursued from that time to the present.

I do not think that a very large proportion of the clerks have been asked to work unusual hours, but that a few of them are required to work longer than seven hours a day at the present time goes without saying. It is proper that they should do so; and I hope that they are doing so cheerfully, as some of the clerks tell me they are doing.

It seems to me, if we are going to change the hours during which clerks shall work in the various departments and activities of the Government, that we ought to amend the law of 1898; and if it is desirable to make the standard seven-and-a-half hours or eight hours instead of seven hours, we ought to act courageously and settle the matter in that way; but I agree with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] that, if we are going to do that, we ought to provide that the clerks shall be allowed for overtime work. The suggestion the Senator from Georgia made yesterday that, if the clerks are required to work over eight hours, there ought to be an accurate account kept of it, and they should be either paid for overtime work or credited with the number of extra hours work and be excused from work a sufficient number of days later on to cover the excess of time they had labored. I think that a better plan than is the overtime-payment plan.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like, while the Senator is on the floor, to read the amendment I intend to offer, so that I may have the benefit of the Senator's views on it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to have the Senator read it, because it rather appealed to me when I heard him suggest it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The amendment I intend to propose reads as follows:

*Provided*, That hereafter record shall be kept of all hours of daily work in excess of eight hours by each employee, and employees who have worked extra hours shall be allowed an equal number of hours without work, with full pay, and the holiday shall be given as soon as practicable after the work has been performed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if we are to have an eight-hour day, instead of a seven-hour day, that will be, I think, a wise solution, and one that will do justice to the clerks who are called upon to work over eight hours in emergencies or when the work is in arrears. I shall vote for that amendment if offered; but I am not prepared to commit myself to vote against the motion made by the Senator from Texas, because I am not at all sure that we ought to interfere with this matter at the present time, unless we take up the act of 1898 and amend it, if we think it needs amending. I do not like to have that statute standing on the books, and at the same time have the so-called Borland amendment, simply controlling the appropriations for one department of the Government, injected into an appropriation bill in conflict with the law as it stands at the present time.

We want, Mr. President, to do equal and exact justice in this matter—and I feel sure that every Member of this body feels about it precisely as I do—and we do not want to go about it in a blundering sort of way. I think the Borland amendment as it now stands is a blundering piece of legislation. It has little in it that is scientific or that is calculated to go to the root of the difficulty and correct any evils that may exist at the present time.

As a rule, I have no doubt the clerks in the departments are faithful and honest and are discharging their duties conscientiously. It is true that as to a great many of them seven hours a day is all that they ought to work. We are face to face with an unfortunate situation so far as our departmental employees are concerned. We have no law that retires them after they become inefficient, and they are kept in the service long after efficiency comes to an end. I went into a room in a certain department of the Government not long ago and it looked to me very much like an old ladies' home; there were women there who ought not to be required to sit at desks even one-half of eight hours a day, and I can not conceive that they are of very much service to the Government. Men over 80 years of age are being employed in clerical work in some of the departments of the Government, and, while there may be cases where they can still continue to do good service, the fact is that most of them are not capable of performing the service that is expected of them.

Now, Mr. President, I think I have stated my position, which in a sense is somewhat contradictory, perhaps, but my desire to do the right thing is so intense that I do not want to make any mistake in the attitude I shall take or in the vote I shall cast. For that reason I shall vote for the amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia to amend the bill so that if the Borland amendment shall receive the support of a majority of the Senate it will be greatly improved by that amendment of the Senator from Georgia; but whether the amendment shall be agreed to or not, I shall hold in reserve my vote on the motion made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator yield to me, that I may offer the amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I offer the amendment that I send to the desk, to follow the Borland amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, line 16, after the word "day," it is proposed to insert the following:

*Provided*, That hereafter record shall be kept of all hours of daily work in excess of eight hours by each employee, and employees who have worked extra hours shall be allowed an equal number of hours without work, with full pay, and the holiday shall be given as soon as practicable after the extra work has been performed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume that that amendment is being read now for information.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is formally offered now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The motion pending is a motion to strike out the clause in the bill known as the Borland amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is in order first to perfect the text of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand the suggestion of the Senator from Texas, but we have a right to perfect the text of the bill before the motion to strike out is put, and the proviso that I propose to add is to perfect it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall also offer the following amendment:

*Provided, That work required in excess of eight hours shall be paid for at the rate of one and one-half times the regular compensation of the employee, computed on an hourly basis.*

If we are going to have the eight-hour day, let us have the standard eight-hour regulation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Texas a question?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I beg pardon of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Has any increase in the salaries been allowed these employees?

Mr. SHEPPARD. There has not been.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the remarks submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] disclose the evils of legislation effected by riders to general appropriation bills. There is a statute upon the law books of the United States, enacted about 20 years ago, which has been read to the Senate and which will be affected by this rider, yet the rider ignores it entirely, inasmuch as it does not purport to repeal that statute. If the amendment shall be adopted, however, it will in effect deprive the beneficiaries of the statutory provision. I do not approve of such legislation, and yet it is an established method of congressional procedure. I shall nevertheless vote against the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. President, I sometimes think that the Democratic Party should change one of its slogans by reversing it, and declare itself for special privileges to all and equal rights to none. Since my entrance into this body, and especially since the 4th of March, 1913, we have probably enacted more class legislation than can be found in the acts of preceding Congresses. It is not necessary to enumerate them. Suffice it to say, I have tried to be consistent by voting against all of them. The act to be affected by this amendment, however, was not one placed upon the statute books by a Democratic Congress. Consistency would require that we remove it if we sincerely oppose class legislation, not because of the class which it affects, but because it is class legislation.

Moreover, Mr. President, I have been for nearly half a century an advocate of the eight-hour law. It has been accepted by the common verdict of nearly all civilized countries as a proper standard for a day's work, and exceptions to it by lowering the scale necessarily become examples that will be fruitful of similar legislation. Take, for instance, the present conditions. I know of no reason why one class of employees should be privileged to work but seven hours while all other classes are required to work at least eight hours. Of course I am aware that the law carries with it the power to the heads of departments or of bureaus to require longer hours of labor; but, Mr. President, we always follow the lines of least resistance, and it is much easier to make no exception to the general operation of the law than to make one or many exceptions. Necessarily they breed discontent between those who are required to work longer hours and those who are permitted to enjoy the benefits of the statute. Moreover, I am surprised that it has not long ago prompted other branches of the service to insist upon the same privilege. That it will now come, I make no doubt.

Mr. President, why should not every employee of the Government work eight hours? I know it has been argued here, and it will be argued again, that eight hours is too long for certain people—women, for example—and that the constant employment of one's energies for an unbroken period of seven hours is apt to result in nervous breakdown. If that is true, then the statute should be changed, not by increasing the hours of labor but by diminishing them. And I am surprised if the statement be true that employees of other countries working for more than eight hours have survived so serious an affliction.

Mr. President, I can not assent to the proposition that eight hours' work—intelligent work—carried on under and amid surroundings such as exist in the city of Washington can hurt anybody. On the contrary, it should be a stimulus to every normal individual. The only real happiness in this world is enjoyed by the man or woman who is in love with his or her work, who takes pride in its proper performance and joy in the production resulting from it.

One of the great evils of the day is the constant effort, organized and unorganized, to escape from labor and to live without resort to it. This Nation was never so vigorous and never so prosperous as when there was work for all and men and women worked for love of it, for the incentive which inspired it, and for the fruits which it produced.

Of course, after our great factories were established and the lines became more and more closely drawn and greed, selfishness, and avarice manifested themselves in the reduction of wages, in carelessness or indifference to sanitary surroundings, and to the risks consequent upon these pursuits, organizations of workmen became absolutely essential. They naturally sprang from the conditions requiring collective action and collective bargaining. But, Mr. President, I think that the employees of the United States, taken by and large, in normal times are among the best-paid people in the world. I know, Mr. President, that fixed salaries in times of expansion of currency always result in hardship to their recipients; and such may be the case now, when men and women working for the Government at ordinary salaries contrast them with the wages of ordinary unorganized laborers, the demand for which at this time is unparalleled. But there is this difference—and it is to my mind a fundamental one—that in the case of the average laborer the present conditions are abnormal, while in the case of the vast civil service of the United States conditions, while out of adjustment now, are permanent in their character and should be legislated for accordingly.

If I understand this amendment, it is merely designed to equalize hours of labor; and I do not understand why so much feeling, so much resentment, should be manifested against what seems to be a fair proposition and one which should have been considered many years ago. I see no signs upon the streets or in the departments, the bureaus, or the commissions of those nervous breakdowns, those unfortunate physical consequences which are said to result from a close application of this law.

I happened to be in the War Department yesterday when the hour for ceasing work arrived. I never saw a more buoyant set of men and women of all ages, and I wondered, if these were a fair sample of the physical condition of our employees, how it could be possible that more than seven hours of labor would result in reducing these people to a condition of complete or semi-invalidism, thus interfering with their well-being in life. I have no fear, Mr. President, of any such consequences. They are imaginary.

We have permitted the employees of the Government to organize. They are a compact organization, or series of organizations, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Now, Mr. President, I think that is unfortunate. I do not believe that those who serve their Government, who receive their salaries from it, whose positions are therefore public or semi-public, should be included in the list of wage earners affiliating with the American Federation of Labor. Embarrassments, and very serious ones, may result from such industrial conditions.

For example, Mr. President, suppose we should be so unfortunate as to encounter the miseries of a widespread strike called, if you please, by the main federation. That would present to the organized Government employee the alternative of doing his duty by his Government or by his organization—an alternative to which no right-minded man or woman should be subjected. There is another reason, Mr. President, which is that the organization having succeeded the individual, the needs which they think they require and believe they require are not asked for but are demanded.

I was sorry, Mr. President, while this bill was pending in the House to receive an advertisement entitled "The Borland Amendment," which makes reflections upon a most useful Member of Congress, which, to say the least of it, is subject to adverse criticism. If the independence of the Representatives of the Nation finding expression in what they conceive to be the line of their duty is to be subject to such exhibitions of resentment and criticisms as are embodied in this and similar statements, if a man in the performance of his duty as he sees it is to be subjected to such attacks, then surely the result must be a serious interference with the performance of that duty; for no man, I care not how courageous he may be in legislation of this kind, which we must admit is political in one of its phases, can act with the same freedom, with the same devotion, and with the same energy he can exercise under other circumstances; and if there were no other reason for my voting for the Borland amendment than this campaign systematically waged against him, that would determine my course. That is to say, if I had any doubt as to my duty in the premises I would solve the doubt in the direction of the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is dealing now with a very important phase of this bill, one



which I think should be considered by every Senator who desires to do his duty and is not afraid to do his duty against the organization of employees of the Government. I think all the Senators ought to hear what the Senator from Colorado says; and if he will pardon me—

Mr. THOMAS. I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. KING (continuing). I was about to suggest, and desired to suggest, the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, no benefit can come from the suggestion. Senators will come in and answer to their names and leave.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They are eating their lunch.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, whether they are eating their lunch or not, they will come and answer and leave; and so far as I am concerned, I do not want to inflict my remarks upon any unwilling auditor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I know several Senators, anyway, who would be very glad to hear this phase of the subject discussed by the able Senator from Colorado; and I hope he will pardon me while I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	Nelson	Smoot
Baird	Henderson	New	Stone
Beckham	Hollis	Norris	Sutherland
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Nugent	Thomas
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Tillman
Cummins	Kellogg	Penrose	Townsend
Curtis	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Dillingham	King	Pittman	Vardaman
Fletcher	Kirby	Ransdell	Wadsworth
France	Knox	Reed	Walsh
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Shafroth	Warren
Gallinger	McCumber	Sheppard	Watson
Gronna	McKellar	Shields	Weeks
Hale	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Harding	McNary	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. LEWIS. At this juncture permit me to announce the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] occasioned by personal illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the quorum has been called. I think it has resulted in the physical presence of two more Senators than were in the Chamber when the Senator from Utah made his suggestion, so the result is as I anticipated.

Mr. President, these employees' organizations, like all others, have their legislative delegates, walking and otherwise. They have their legislative committees, just as the other organizations of the country do. That is perhaps permissible if the organizations are to be; but it is something of a travesty upon our civil service that there should be committees on legislation paying attention to bills before Congress and drawing salaries from the Government or, if not drawing salaries during that time, compensated by other employees from their salaries while engaged in influencing legislation. Prior to the time of these organizations such things were unheard of. Now, the pressure brought or sought to be brought to bear for or against legislation is precisely the pressure of other similar committees and delegates, and it includes, among other things, its political feature. These men vote, a great many of the women vote, and very soon all of them will vote.

I do not know of a greater coward on earth than a Member of Congress who wants to succeed himself, unless it is the ordinary American business man; and of course pressure, semipolitical in its character, exerted by organizations can only be resisted at the risk of possible or probable defeat. I want to protest here and now against the extension of that practice to the men and women in the employ of the Government, drawing their pay from the United States Treasury. I want to be perfectly fair in my criticism, Mr. President. I do not mean to make a statement which can be interpreted to mean that these particular organizations differ in their methods, are more unfair, more unjust, or more exacting, than the others. Quite the contrary; but the others are outside organizations, not protected by a Civil Service Commission, which gives a tenure of life in practically all cases, and upon which, of course, absolute reliance can be placed so long as the employee does his or her duty. They must organize to protect themselves, a condition wholly absent from the public employees.

This amendment, Mr. President, as it passed the House, does not effect the wages or salaries of employees. As amended by

the Senator from Georgia, it does, and I think reference was made to the pendency in the House now of a bill which is designed to provide for a horizontal raise of from \$120 to \$180 per year as the House shall finally determine after discussion.

Mr. President, if that bill becomes law—and I have no doubt that it will—its only effect upon the employees will be to use them as a conduit to transfer that amount of money from the Treasury of the United States to their landlords and their boarding-house keepers and merchants, because as the salaries are raised the price of the necessities of life will be raised also. That is why every merchant and every landlord and every newspaper in town is for it.

It will not solve the problem, because we may legislate as we may with regard to salaries; the purveyors will "beat us to it," as the saying is, in so adjusting their prices as to absorb the increase; and next year these people will be in the same predicament as they are now, with the difference that something like fifty or sixty million dollars of money will have been transferred through their agency from the Treasury to the people of the District.

If I lived here, perhaps I might for that reason join in the hue and cry to increase wages. I recognize as fully as anyone can that at present it is very difficult for the salaried employee to make both ends meet. I should like to see Congress tackle the problem at the other end, and I think perhaps we will do it. The Johnson bill is a good start in that direction, although we may not agree with all of its provisions. Some may consider it too drastic, and others not drastic enough; but that, Mr. President, is the only way in which we can legislate for the benefit of those who need relief at this time, because of the conditions I have discussed.

The argument, perhaps, will not appeal to this Congress; it did not appeal to any of the Congresses of which I have been a Member, because the easiest thing in the world to do in Congress is to pass an appropriation bill. It makes no difference what the purpose of the bill may be; it would seem that its passage is certain if it takes money out of the Treasury; and in this time of national peril the tendency to appropriate money from the Treasury of the United States is increasing, instead of decreasing, in every direction.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will agree with me in the added suggestion that it becomes easier the larger the appropriation bill is.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I used to think so; but I have observed lately that when specific appropriations have been attacked they have been defended upon the ground that they are so small as to be wholly inconsequential. Why should we object, for instance, to a miserable little appropriation of \$250,000 for something, or of two millions, or of five millions? Why take up the time of the Senate and of the House in the discussion of the small appropriations which will not sensibly affect the aggregate? Mr. President, the Treasury of the United States is bleeding from every pore, and, instead of stanching it, I sometimes think that every other man and woman in the country are out with their knives looking for some unsevered, hidden artery to cut in twain.

We passed two pension bills this morning, taking only 15 or 20 minutes of time, increasing the amount of pensions. We did not concern ourselves enough about it to run down the list and see whether they were all meritorious cases and whether some might be undesirable. When the Senator from Florida, Mr. Bryan, was here he and I used to attempt, vainly attempt, to modify the pension bills in some respect. We got nowhere, and we never will. I have given it up, for, Mr. President, that practice will continue just as long as the price of living rises, because the idea of a pension now is not a contribution for service so much as a good living due from the Government to the pensionary.

Take the situation, Mr. President, of the country generally with regard to our expenditures. The word profiteer has become as common on American lips as the word camouflage to a Frenchman. We have so far called the attention of the country to a number of shocking instances of huge profits, extortionate profits—I almost said treasonable profits—that some people calling themselves patriots are drawing from the Treasury of the United States in the performance of contracts for the production of many goods and articles absolutely essential to the salvation of the Republic; yet the work goes on, with no indication of diminution or of cessation.

On the other hand, Mr. President, we find similar deplorable conditions disfiguring the industrial situation all over the United

States. Labor is discontented, and the higher the wage it gets the more discontented it becomes. The newspapers announced two or three days ago that 185 men, forming the calkers' union, receiving more wages than they ever dreamed of two years ago, had struck for higher pay, and as a consequence had paralyzed the entire shipping program in the Northwest. I do not know whether it has been settled or not. Shortly before then the carpenters' union struck and suspended work in the great shipyards of the Atlantic seacoast. The president of the union, when appealed to, said that he could not control his men. When a union reaches such an extremity as that its chosen and elected officers can not control it, then it would seem to a man of ordinary common sense that in such a crisis some authority should do so.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] the other day in one of the ablest addresses that ever fell from the lips of a Senator in this body demonstrated the awful condition of the labor market and its sinister effect upon our shipping program. He spoke to about as many Senators as do me the honor of their presence. About the only immediate effect of his speech was to provoke a remonstrance from this side of the Chamber. Yet, Mr. President, he told the Nation the truth, a truth so ghastly in its possible consequences that I sometimes shudder to think of it.

Here is a telegram from Boston, March 12:

From April 6 to October 6, 1917, there were strikes at 2,521 establishments, the existence of which was definitely verified by the board. Each establishment was asked to report on causes, but complete information was received from only 1,156.

These plants showed 283,402 men idle and 6,285,519 days of production lost. Opinions were asked also of labor commissioners and mediators, etc.

More than six and a quarter million working days lost forever and the country in the midst of the greatest war ever known, or that ever will be known in history, whose outcome is wholly dependent upon the active development of our program, long ago outlined.

Let me refer to one or two other manifestations of a prevailing desire for money which rises superior to love of country. A distinguished general was ordered to France the other day and is on the water now. Whether he lands or not depends largely upon the accident of fortune. Within two days of his sailing his wife's landlord demanded \$250 a month rent from her in place of \$100 that she had been paying. I know another gallant officer whose wife has suffered from similar conditions.

The program lags, Mr. President, while we make appropriations, while some people work only seven hours a day, while others work fitfully or do not work at all, no matter what their wages, and others profiteer upon a larger scale.

Mr. President, I sometimes wonder if there is in America the true spirit of patriotism. I sometimes wonder whether this Nation must not be confronted with a mighty disaster before its various parts shall be knit together to create the spirit which manifested itself in the people and the armies of the North and the South during the Rebellion. I sometimes wonder whether the charge of our enemies that we have become so devoted to money making that our national virtues have been submerged may not be true.

Mr. President, we have a large Army in France. We shall have a larger one as soon as we can get it there. It all depends on ships whether we get them there or whether we can care for them after we have transported them there. Some of us realize the serious side of this mighty problem, and fear that the Imperial Government of Germany may make good the threats it announced when the submarine warfare was declared. I wonder, Mr. President, what may be the thoughts, the reflections, and reproaches of those may be who are charged—the rich and the poor—with the awful responsibility of supplying our means of transportation if after landing a huge army we shall be unable to supply it the provision and equipment essential, not to victory alone but to their very existence.

We all have boys in this war, our own boys and the boys of our friends. We have sent and are sending them across the sea. They are giving, as Mr. Lincoln said, to the cause of liberty the highest test of devotion. Their hopes, their ambitions, are lofty. They believe in democracy; they are willing to die for it, but with their faces to the enemy.

But, Mr. President, if because of our attention to trivial things, if because of the delays due to demands for the increase of wages rises above the immediate and terrible needs of the hour, the time shall come when these soldiers of freedom bearing the American flag, confronted on one side by the most brutal and most powerful and inexorable foe that ever existed and on the other by starvation through lack of supplies, with no guns, with no food, with nothing but the alternative of sacrifice or sur-

render, what shall become of the great Republic, the last hope of freedom? What will posterity say of this generation, so miserably failing in such a crisis?

I do not like to paint a picture like this, Mr. President. Sometimes it keeps me awake at nights. I must contemplate it, Mr. President, for it is not wholly improbable. I would to God that some genius could rise upon whose lips both cherubim and seraphim have breathed the fires of eloquence to sound a trumpet call to this Nation, arouse it from its dormant state and awaken it to a vivid sense of its imperious duty.

Mr. President, this has but little to do with the amendment I am considering, but it is quite appropriate in view of the fact that it, too, calls for appropriations, more appropriations, and more money; as we now propose to amend it, and it is appropriate to call attention to the fact that it is the practice everywhere, that we do not seem fully alive to its probable consequences in this time of universal warfare.

Mr. President, this generation of Americans do not understand the meaning of sacrifice. Would they might recall what their fathers and mothers endured 50 years ago in this country, those of us who lived in the South during the last two years of that awful conflict. Would they might reflect more deeply upon what has occurred in the desolated regions of France and Italy. Then they would have some slight appreciation of sacrifice.

Automobiles whirling through the streets of this and other cities with their drivers and their footmen, occupied by fashion and pleasure. Women are doing all in their power to help the cause, and that is comforting. Many have devoted themselves unreservedly to the cause of the soldier. I do not know of a hotel in this city that has not its lackeys at the door, its bands of music, and its appointments of luxury just as in times of peace. The lights upon Broadway and other great centers of amusement in the various metropolises of the Nation are just as bright and their habits as active and free from care as though no world tragedy were in progress beyond the sea.

Over us all, Mr. President, stalks the specter of possible defeat. May it never come; if it does it will be due to our indifference to our duty and our failure to meet a world crisis fraught with terrible consequences to humanity and to civilization.

Mr. SMOOT. It is unfortunate, Mr. President, that a speech such as has just been delivered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] could not be heard by all the people of the United States. If it were possible for such a thing, no man could count the advantage to our country. I sometimes feel, as the Senator said he feels, that it is almost a waste of time to stand on the floor of the Senate and call attention to the wicked extravagances in the appropriations of sums of money that are so vast that the mind of man can not comprehend them.

I am in favor of doing everything in reason for the clerks of the Government. A year ago I offered the amendment to the first appropriation bill that carried the increases to those clerks. I recognized at the time the amendment was offered that there were injustices in it and did not do justice to all cases. I have been interested in the past in studying the conditions under which the clerks in the different departments of our Government labor, and I admit there are many, many cases where wrongs should be righted. There are clerks who are underpaid; there are more of them who are overpaid; and a more just action could not be consummated by Congress nor one that would be of greater advantage to the Government and to the employees of the Government than to have the question of salary investigated by a joint committee of Congress—one having an interest in seeing that the evils now in force in all the departments of our Government are rectified.

Mr. President, I know the law fixes a certain salary for a certain class of clerks. We have class 1, class 2, class 3, and class 4. We have the laborers, we have the watchmen, we have the charwomen, and others. The salary of all these different classes of employees is fixed by law, and no Senator who has ever taken an interest in this question and visited the departments long enough to make a casual examination but what knows that there are clerks in class 1 who are underpaid, and there are clerks in class 1 who are overpaid, and there ought to be some system put in force by Congress to see that a man or a woman receives all that his or her labor is worth, no more and no less.

I recognize, Mr. President, that under the present war conditions such evils have been multiplied manifold, and necessarily so, on account of the influx into this city of tens of thousands of additional clerks taken from all parts of the United States, many not required to pass the civil-service examinations, others passing them, but totally unfit to do the work.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—



The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I assume that the Senator knows no way that a differentiation could be made between the efficiency of one clerk and another as long as they are classified.

Mr. SMOOT. That can not be done under present practices, Mr. President, and that is why I am calling the matter to the attention of the Senate. I think there ought to be, and I want to say to the Senator there will be a change before many years.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope so.

Mr. SMOOT. It can not go on the way it is at present.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is another matter that I meant to touch upon in the few words I uttered upon this subject, and that was that the larger amount paid to some clerks of less efficiency than others comes to some extent from favoritism in the department on the part of the man at the head of a division or the chief clerk, where favorites are promoted and others are demoted because of the great variety of so-called reasons.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is absolutely correct, and no Senator who has served in this body for a year has not discovered that to be the case.

Mr. KING. Will my colleague yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. KING. While speaking about the inequality existing and the evils which prevail now in the departments, I want to call attention to one evil that I have found, namely, that in promotions there is a disposition to disregard what I understand ought to be the rule and promote with reference to efficiency, but the promotions are based almost exclusively in some departments upon seniority of service.

Mr. SMOOT. I know there are some departments that adhere to that strictly. In fact, I have had heads of departments come to me and say that under the practice of the department in the past he was compelled to promote Mr. So-and-so, and if promoted he knew he can not do the work. This practice ought to be stopped and some time or other it will be stopped.

Mr. President, we passed this week an urgent deficiency bill adding millions to the amount that the House provided. I can not remember just the amount of the increase, but millions of dollars; and there is no need to mention the matter if less than \$100,000,000, for \$100,000,000 to-day is considered a very small amount. But, Senators, do you know that if that bill had remained in the Senate unacted upon another 24 hours we would have been asked to increase it \$500,000,000 more, and would have been told the amount was vitally necessary and must be provided at once.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator is right in saying we escaped being asked to add \$500,000,000 to that bill by passing it the day we did. That was a fact.

Mr. SMOOT. No doubt of it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What was the other \$500,000,000 for?

Mr. SMOOT. The most of the estimates came from the War Department, I will say to the Senator.

The amount asked for will be included in the next urgent deficiency bill, which will follow in a very little while.

Beginning the 6th of April a drive for the third liberty loan will be commenced and the people will be asked to subscribe to it. Not only will they be expected to subscribe to the liberty loan amounting to billions of dollars, but the American people before June 30 of this year will be called upon to pay \$4,500,000,000 of taxes into the Treasury.

Mr. President, I have absolute confidence in the loyalty of all classes of the American people, and I do not believe that the coming liberty loan is going to fail, but I do know that the question of its absolute necessity must be presented to the people of the United States in such a way that they will feel its necessity to such an extent that they will be willing to sacrifice some of the usual necessities of life and all the luxuries. I think it is going to be a real task to place the coming bond issue, much harder than it was for the first or the second issues, and perhaps the next one will be still harder. This being the case, we ought to be able to go to the people with clean hands, as far as the accounting for the money appropriated by Congress is concerned. We ought to be able to say to the people of the United States that every dollar collected through taxation, every dollar that you have advanced to the Government in return for Government bonds, has been spent wisely, judiciously, and without graft.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator would have great difficulty, would he not, in convincing the American people that what they have already raised has been spent judiciously and carefully? All we may hope for is that we may convince them that that which we will raise in the future will be so expended.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am fearful from the rumblings that I hear from all parts of the United States that it is leaking out, and the American people are beginning to believe that the money they have subscribed in the past for our bonds and the taxes that they are paying has not been spent to the best advantage. I want now to say that if we do not begin to scrutinize all the appropriations made and require evidence that the amounts that are asked for by all the departments of the Government are absolutely necessary for the economic maintenance of the Government we are going to get into trouble.

I am in favor of the Borland provision, with the modification that I expect will be offered to it. I am in favor of an eight-hour day. When the clerks came to me and asked me if I would not oppose the Borland amendment—the clerks for whom I worked for an increase wage last year, the clerks for whom I am willing to work this year—I told them I could not do so. I also stated I would gladly vote for an increase in their salaries even greater than they were allowed last year. I do not believe it is fair to the clerks as a whole to place them in the position before the American people of being unwilling to work eight hours for the Government of the United States, particularly so, Mr. President, during the crisis we are passing through.

How can we explain such an attitude to the farmer, who is asked to work not eight hours but, as everybody knows, 10, 12, and 14 hours a day? He is pleaded with to work longer and faster in order to raise sufficient food to feed the American people, to feed our allies, and even feed the clerks employed by our Government. I believe that if we could take a vote of the clerks themselves a great majority of them would say that they were perfectly willing to work eight hours a day during the continuance of the war. The Borland amendment says that the day shall not be less than eight hours, and that is the only change from the present law, which is seven hours.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that the clerks have 30 days leave of absence every year, with full pay. They are entitled to 30 days sick leave, with full pay; and, as far as I am concerned, I want the clerks of the Government to be paid as well as any other laborers in all the world doing the same class of work.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. STERLING. Do I understand the Senator to say that they have 30 days sick leave as well as 30 days annual leave?

Mr. SMOOT. They are entitled to 30 days sick leave in case they are sick.

Mr. STERLING. With pay?

Mr. SMOOT. With pay; and if, for any reason, they are sick longer than 30 days, then an extension of 30 days can be granted them; but that is without pay.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator state, on the average, what percentage of the 30 days in our departments is taken up each year by sick leave, if the Senator knows?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say that in some of the departments the clerks take a greater percentage than in others. I have not the figures here with me, but I have them in my office, and I think it runs all the way from an average of 5 days in some of the departments up to over 20 days in others.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. It would be safe to say that taking the departments as a whole there is one month and two-thirds, or 20 days, in which this pay is granted although no service is given to the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Less than 20 days, I will say.

President, it has been said that the clerks are now working over seven hours a day, without pay.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HARDING. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMOOT. I will.

Mr. HARDING. Does the Senator include in the time unemployed the half holidays in summer?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I forgot to call attention to that.

Mr. HARDING. Will the Senator say how many half holidays are allowed the Government employees with pay?

Mr. SMOOT. That only happens in the summer time—in the real hot days of summer—when they get a half holiday every Saturday.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. REED. Is it not the Senator's opinion that if this bill is passed as it came from the House, no pay can be received by any clerk who has a half holiday on Saturday?

Mr. SMOOT. Why, no, Mr. President; because this amendment—the so-called Borland amendment—does not change the law from what it is to-day, with the exception of making it eight hours instead of seven.

Mr. REED. No; I beg the Senator's pardon. If the Senator will read the language of this amendment, I think he will change his opinion; and I will ask him to read it now, if he has it before him.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I have it. I will say to the Senator that that is the position taken not only by the author of the amendment but by other speakers in the House of Representatives. I will read it, however, now.

Mr. REED. The opinion of the author of the amendment would not have any effect on my judgment.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, that may be.

The amendment, Mr. President, reads as follows:

No part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used to pay salaries or for personal services in any department, bureau, or office in the District of Columbia which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day.

Now, Mr. President, I want to read, in that connection, section 7 of the legislative appropriation bill referred to.

Sec. 7. That section 5 of the act making appropriations for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, approved March 3, 1893, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Hereafter it shall be the duty of the heads of the several executive departments, in the interest of the public service, to require of all clerks and other employees, of whatever grade or class, in their respective departments, not less than seven hours of labor each day, except Sundays and days declared public holidays by law or Executive order."

Mr. President, the amendment does not change that situation at all, and an Executive order could be issued, if this amendment is passed, giving half holidays on Saturdays during the summer months and pay for them just as they have been paid for in the past.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, is the Senator in favor of that?

Mr. SMOOT. Of the half holidays?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, certainly, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. Then I should like to know the logic of standing and in one breath declaring that the employees ought to be made to work eight hours a day and in the next breath saying that they ought to be let off on Saturday afternoon by Executive order.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, I can see the soundest of logic in the position that I take. Everyone during the heated summer term in Washington is almost compelled to take some sort of rest. The half holidays are generally granted at a time when Congress is not in session, when there is very little to be done in the departments, and it is left entirely with the Executive to issue the order. If the Executive says that every employee of this Government shall only work a half day on Saturdays during the summer, he has that power and that right, and he has exercised it in the past, and I think exercised it wisely. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that it is not a question of dollars and cents that influences me in my action.

Mr. REED. What is it, then?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a question of having the employees of the Government, when the requirements caused by this war are so great, to work eight hours a day.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, does not the Senator know that the head of any department can call upon the employees to-day to work 8 hours or 9 hours or 10 hours or 12 hours a day without a penny of extra pay, and that, if the work is behind, the heads of departments will do it, and that they have done it, and that the clerks have uncomplainingly performed the labor?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what the Senator says is right; but the Senator knows that the head of every department has accepted our suggestion in the law that the workday will be seven hours, and that the heads of departments are not going to change it until Congress acts.

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, they have done it. They are doing it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will come to that, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. Many persons have made the statement just made by the Senator from Missouri that the heads of the departments are requiring the employees of the Government to work eight hours and even more without extra pay. Senators, I ask you to go down to any of the departments of this Government and, when the clock reaches 4.30, stand at the door that the employees come out of and see if 99 per cent of all who are inside do not leave the building. I am not denying the fact that there are a few special clerks that are working 10 hours and 12 hours, and I think, in some cases, perhaps 14 hours a day; but it is generally the clerks to the chief of the bureau or the head of the division or of the department who work extra hours.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I have observed that very thing, and the evil of that is that the man who has proved his efficiency is the man who has to do the extra work. The inefficient are never kept.

Mr. SMOOT. Necessarily so.

I have a good deal of sympathy with the heads of the departments under the conditions existing today. You can visit some of these departments, crowded with employees, the hallways crowded, and just spend a little time, and see if the work is being done as it would be done if it were a private concern. I have spoken to officials of departments about it, and they tell me it is the best help that they can get. They recognize that there is inefficiency. Why, Mr. President, I have seen typists with copy before them writing about like this: "H." (a pause), "R." (a pause). And so it is.

Mr. GALLINGER. These typists are expected to copy, and the way some of them copy is exactly as the Senator from Utah describes; but they do not follow an "h" with an "r." They really are more intelligent than that.

Mr. SMOOT. I think there is a good deal in the charge made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] that there are so many employees in some of the bureaus standing around that at times they are actually in the way of each other. That comes about in this way: In the case of some of the commissions that we have created, just as soon as the man is selected as the head of the commission his thought has been to make it the greatest commission created by Congress; and the same thing applies to a number of our bureaus. If there is one commission that has 1,500 employees, the head of the next one created looks upon the 1,500 employees as not the limit that he intends to reach, but he is to exceed it and have more employees under his charge.

Mr. President, I do not know that it is worth while to take the time of the Senate further to discuss this question. I think the Senators have made up their minds pretty well now as to what they are going to do.

I do not believe that in voting for the motion which has been made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] we shall be doing any favor to the clerks of the Government. I do not believe that if the clerks themselves had the question to decide they would ask Congress to vote for his amendment. I believe they are just as loyal as are other working people in the United States; I believe that they are willing to make sacrifices, if necessary, the same as are other laboring people in the United States, and I do not believe if their Government asks them during this war to work eight hours that generally they are going to complain, though some may do so. I believe that the great bulk of them will be only too glad to work eight hours for the Government while we are passing through this crisis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. NELSON. What is the amendment, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I will state the amendment in a moment. The Borland amendment establishes an eight-hour day, and the amendment to the Borland amendment, which I have offered, provides that any hours that the employees work beyond eight hours on any day shall be made of record and that they shall be allowed the hours covered by the extra work as a deduction from eight-hour days as soon as practicable, so that their actual work shall be only eight hours a day continuously, the extra work to be credited to them as holidays later on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the action which has heretofore been taken by Congress in reference to persons who are engaged in work covered by contracts with the United States. On March 4, 1917, Congress enacted the following:

That in case of national emergency the President is authorized to suspend provisions of law prohibiting more than eight hours' labor in any one day of persons engaged upon work covered by contracts with the United States: *Provided further*, That the wages of persons em-



ployed upon such contracts shall be computed on a basic day rate of eight hours' work, with overtime rates to be paid for at not less than time and one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight hours.

The President has put that authority into operation on more than one occasion. On the 22d of March, 1917, the following Executive order was issued:

Law of March 4, 1917.

In order to enable the Navy Department to meet the requirements of law to secure the more expeditious construction of ships and procurement of munitions authorized, and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," whereby it is provided "That in case of national emergency the President is authorized to suspend provisions of law prohibiting more than eight hours' labor in any one day of persons engaged upon work covered by contracts with the United States: *Provided further*, That the wages of persons employed upon such contracts shall be computed on a basic day rate of eight hours' work, with overtime rates to be paid for at not less than time and one-half for all hours work in excess of eight hours." I do hereby authorize the suspension of the provisions of law prohibiting more than eight hours of labor in any one day of persons engaged in such work under contract with the Navy Department in all navy yards and private establishments where such suspension of the provisions of the law will result in hastening preparation to meet present emergency conditions.

A similar order was issued in reference to contracts for buildings under construction or to be constructed at arsenals, and for fortification work. The President also issued the same order as to laborers working under contract with the Department of Agriculture and on a number of other occasions.

Why should we be less considerate of persons who are employed by the Department of Agriculture than Congress has already been as to laborers who were working under contract with the Government? Why should not department employees also, who work more than eight hours, have time and one-half for overtime? Now, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] wants to give them the poor boon of an hour's vacation for each hour's extra work. They may not be in position to take a vacation; they may be compelled from dire necessity to work every day in order to earn their daily bread. If we are going to work them more than eight hours, let us put in a provision for time and a half for overtime and adopt the standard eight-hour principle.

If the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia shall be voted down, I propose to offer an amendment that for all work over eight hours employees shall be paid time and a half for such overtime, in order that we may treat them with at least the same consideration that has been accorded to laborers who are working under contract with the Government and with the departments of the Government.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] has a great, large farming population in his State, the same as we have in the State of North Dakota. Every dollar in my State that goes into liberty bonds or that goes into taxes has first to be lured out of the ground bosom of old Mother Earth; none of it comes from anywhere else. The men who lure that out of the earth with ardent hearts and strong arms labor more than eight hours a day. Now, would the Senator support a proposition that for every hour expended upon those farms more than eight hours, the Government in fixing the price of wheat and other products should add a higher price because the hours are longer upon the farm?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly. The Senator from North Dakota made a speech some months ago in the Senate based upon that exact proposition, saying that the price of farm products ought to be based on farm-labor hours in the same way that wages in the cities are based on labor hours in the factory.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; I took the position that like classes of labor should draw the same compensation practically all over the United States. I also asserted that that was not the case, and I could see no possibility in the near future of it being made the case.

Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in 1912 the Secretary of Agriculture made a statement as to what constituted the net earnings of each farm in the United States. Those net earnings, as I now remember, were \$312 per farm. The average number of persons upon every farm, including the husband, the wife, and the children who performed manual labor equivalent to adult labor, approximate five persons. Dividing that \$312 per year among them it amounts to 20 cents net per day each. Therefore, you have got the real actual earnings of the agricultural people in the United States as being 20 cents per day net. Now, you ask those people, who work from 10 to 16 hours a day for 20 cents a day, to go down into their pockets and to pay \$3 and \$4 a day for clerks, and then to give them an additional sum if they work more than 8 hours a day. Mr. President, I can not see any justice in that, and I for one would never vote for such a proposition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did the Senator vote for the law which was passed March 4, 1917, and which I quoted a short while ago?

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to increase their pay to what is reasonable, and then I want them for that pay to perform an honest day's service. If eight hours a day is an honest day's service I want them to perform it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from North Dakota a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator if there is any law in North Dakota limiting the hours which farmers and the farmers' boys and daughters shall work?

Mr. McCUMBER. There is not a single law limiting those hours; there is no such law in the United States, and neither is there any law, let me say to the Senator, that children under 14 or 15 years of age may not work on the farm; but every child that is able to hunt an egg does his part upon the farm. The 12-year-old boy will perform as much labor upon the farm as your 25-year-old boy will in your departments here; and the 12-year-old girl will perform just as much labor upon the farm as will her mother.

Mr. KENYON. And about the time that the clerks are coming down to work the farmer and his family have already performed about four hours' service, have they not?

Mr. McCUMBER. They have. Out in Iowa and North Dakota the sun is pretty high at half past 4 o'clock in the afternoon and the farmer is out in his field, but the bricklayer and the carpenter drop the trowel and the hammer the moment the first stroke of the bell announces that it is half past 4 o'clock. The farmer, however, then has still a quarter of a day's or a half day's work left on his hands to perform.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the difficulty about the amendment of the Senator from Texas is in part that our employees here in Washington are paid salaries by the month; their pay runs by the month and by the year. We make appropriations of so much money for such a place. Now, that entire system would be broken up if there were to be one and a half time extra pay when a clerk works a couple of hours extra. If we are going to give the clerks a credit for extra work beyond the eight hours, the only way to do it is in extra freedom from work; that is to say, they being required to work 10 hours to-day, at the earliest day practicable the day shall be reduced to 6 hours, and the 8-hour average be given as the standard of work. I do not think the 8-hour rule was intended as one of compensation or to increase wages. It has been agreed upon by those who have studied the question as a measure in conservation of human life and human health, and discouragement should be had against more than the 8 hours' labor on any day. The best we can do, if the work extends beyond 8 hours on a particular day, is to give an equivalent in additional rest on a later day, to make up in strength and in health, conserving both for the overstrain of the overworked day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I am impressed with the thought that this is a very unfortunate time to discuss seriously the proposition of shortening the hours of labor which should be required of the people who are working on a salary from the Government. There are hundreds of thousands of these employees, and their number is increasing hourly. The shorter their hours of labor, the more people that can be employed, and the greater the cost to the Government, with no greater amount of work performed. The question of a shorter day, which might be in order in time of peace, might not be in order at this time. I do not think that anyone will claim that the Government clerks as a class in the city of Washington are working overtime or doing too much labor for the Government in its war emergency. It is possible that they may not be receiving enough pay for what they are doing, and if such is the case and the Government can afford it, their pay should be increased. There is a proposition, which is likely to become a law, which will grant them more pay; but what the Government needs at this time is service; and every patriotic employee of the Government, from President down to the humblest clerk, ought to be willing not to watch the clock, but to determine to do as much as he can possibly do for his Government in this crucial hour. That is a duty which every citizen owes to his country. The soldier at the front is not limited by law to service for seven hours a day, and his pay is \$30 a month. The heads of departments are governed by the task to be performed, and not by the clock.

No one pretends, however, that the House provision will impose an unreasonable amount of labor upon the Government clerk. Eight hours a day in time of war does not seem too long for those people to work who are flocking here from every quarter of the United States. No one has a right to expect, and the

Government has no right to pay, a dollar except a full equivalent is rendered. And this applies with equal force to the furnisher of supplies and the furnisher of labor. I know of employees who are in the service of the Government who are working longer hours than their health would permit if continued for a long period, and they are not complaining. This amendment will not affect them.

Eight hours a day has been the desideratum of the laboring people of this country for some time; but now it is claimed that that is too long, and that seven hours only should be required. That is now all that is required, as a rule, of the Government clerks in Washington, as has been already stated. If anyone will go into almost anyone of the departments when the hour of half-past 4 strikes, he will discover that everything is dropped and a rush is made for the cloakroom and from thence to the street. I admit that this is not the fault of the clerk. Indeed, I do not know that the clerks are objecting to a workday of 8 hours. I do not believe that the Borland amendment is a reflection upon Government employees. If it is a reflection upon anyone, it is upon the heads of departments, who have not taken advantage of existing law. Of course, so long as more clerks are employed than can be used, there will be no incentive to obtain proper service from the individual clerk. Incompetent numbers supplant efficiency.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not claimed here that eight hours is too much, but the present law provides for a minimum working day of seven hours, with the right in the head of a department to call for any additional number of hours that may be required. It is practically an unlimited hour day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is true in theory, but the fact is that on the average seven hours is a working day here. There would be no opposition to the provision under discussion if the fact were not true that it is intended to establish an eight-hour day and to provide by law that men and women will be expected to work eight hours a day for their Government in time of war, for which they are receiving and will continue to receive eight hours' pay.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, does the Senator propose to raise the wages if the time of labor is extended? He has just stated that the clerks are receiving eight hours' pay. They are receiving salaries under a law which for 20 years has been upon the statute books and has only required seven hours a day, unless the head of a department orders a longer day; or, rather, the law is that they shall work a minimum of seven hours, and they have, as a general proposition, worked seven hours. That has been the rule for 20 years. Now, the Senator states that the clerks are receiving eight hours' pay and they ought to do eight hours' work. Does the Senator propose to pay them one-eighth more wages if they are required to work one-eighth more time?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Not because the clerks are required to work one-eighth more time. The Senator made that point on yesterday. Eight hours is the standard day. It is true clerks have been working seven hours, but they can not complain if they are made to work eight hours.

Mr. REED. Or 12 hours?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Or 12 hours; but no one would think of working them 12 hours, except in an extreme emergency, which the clerks themselves would recognize as necessary. They can not complain if they are required to work eight hours; and it is proposed to increase their wages whether the present seven-hour day is retained or eight hours a day are required.

Mr. REED. That has nothing whatever to do with the question I put to the Senator. Would the Senator say that the standard day for these clerks is eight hours, when they have for 20 years been working seven hours?

Mr. TOWNSEND. As to some of the clerks that is true, but others of the clerks have worked eight hours, and some of them have worked more than eight hours during the 20 years.

Mr. REED. But the standard is a seven-hour day?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, in practice; but it is too short; there is no question in my mind that it is too short. If the clerks of this Government were compelled to work eight hours a day, there could be accomplished the same amount of work that is now being done in the city of Washington with at least 5,000 fewer clerks. The people are paying the bills; the Government is put to it for money; it is raking the whole country to raise the cash necessary to carry on this war; and every citizen of the country ought to be interested in doing his "bit," especially when he is compensated for it.

I repeat what I said to the Senator from Missouri, that the question of increasing wages is not based upon the question as

to whether or not we shall increase the number of hours to eight, because the increase will be made anyway, and it ought to be done, in my judgment; but what I want is to have the work done. That is what the country needs to-day—the accomplishment of work to carry on war preparations; and instead of some of our people trying to devise ways and means for avoiding responsibility, they ought to devote themselves to the work that is in hand, and which they are hired to perform; and now that this question has arisen Congress must insist that a fair day's pay must command a fair day's work. Personally I do not believe that the conscientious, reliable clerks are opposing this House provision. I have had but one request to vote against it. The man or woman, of whatever rank or station, who is fit to serve this Government is not asking for an opportunity to shirk his duty. For the other kind I have no sympathy, and the sooner some effective weeding-out process is employed the better it will be for the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. STERLING. I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the word "holiday," and insert in lieu thereof the words "credit for overtime," so as to read—

and employees who have worked extra hours shall be allowed an equal number of hours without work, with full pay, and the credit for overtime shall be given as soon as practicable after the extra work has been performed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I accept the amendment to my amendment.

Mr. KING. I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Dakota who has offered the amendment to the amendment if the word "overtime" means additional pay?

Mr. STERLING. No; it means the time over eight hours, eight hours being fixed as the standard.

Mr. KING. The Senator does not contemplate, then, paying additional compensation?

Mr. STERLING. No; not at all.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It really does not change the meaning at all, but expresses it, I think, in a little better language.

Mr. STERLING. The word "holiday," as written in the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, I hardly thought expressed the idea; it is not a holiday strictly speaking, but it is really overtime for which the clerk is entitled to credit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia as modified.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should like to have the amendment read, as I have not been able to be present during all of the discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, at the end of line 16, after the word "day," it is proposed to insert the following proviso.

*Provided*, That hereafter record shall be kept of all hours of daily labor in excess of eight hours by each employee, and employees who have worked extra hours shall be allowed an equal number of hours without work, with full pay, and the credit for overtime shall be given as soon as practicable after the extra work has been performed.

Mr. KING. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether the word "employee" would cover all in the service of the Government in the various departments, including chiefs of bureaus?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Well, the chief of a bureau really has no regular hours of work; he controls his own time. It covers all that class who report by the hour and work by the hour. I think it covers them practically all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether his amendment is intended to apply to any of the employees of the Government outside of those covered by the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It applies only to those covered by the Borland amendment to this bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Borland amendment only covers those in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is as far as we can go at this time. I think the principle, though, if we adopt it, should be extended at once over other employees of the Government in Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. So that the Senator's amendment is not intended to apply to anything except what the Borland amendment applies to?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is all.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not think any Senator will doubt for a moment, if we put this amendment in the first general appropriation bill—and I understand this is the first



of the general appropriation bills—that it will be followed in the same terms in every other appropriation bill, so that it will finally cover all the departments.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say in this connection that I am supporting the Borland amendment on the assumption that it will be applied to all other departments of the Government. I should not be willing to see the Agricultural Department isolated and treated differently from any and all other departments. I think the rule ought to be made universal; but, since the question has been raised, I think that we ought to adopt the Borland amendment. I think the reaction on the psychology of labor throughout this country would be most unfortunate, if not disastrous, if we should limit to seven the working hours for people who have, I may say, liberal compensation, excellent working conditions, and an indefinite tenure, with no uncertainty as to payment. We should not legislate to allow them to labor only 7 hours a day when people on the farms are required to work from 10 to 16 hours a day and the boys in the trenches as long as 30 hours a day, if I may use the word "day" in that connection. I think it would be most unfortunate for us to say to people of that class that those who are most favored, a selected class, shall be given more favorable conditions than the average laboring man throughout this country must submit to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, we have discussed almost every governmental proposition in the consideration of the Borland amendment. In a great many of the suggestions that have been made I can heartily concur.

I heard just the closing part of the address made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. It impressed me very greatly. It was in line with what I have been thinking for some little time. I hope it will be read by all the people of the country.

I can not help but feel that the people of the country do not realize what confronts them—that the people of the country do not realize the necessity for sacrifice in this country—and I can not help but believe that those in authority who know the real situation are making a great mistake in not letting the people of this country know what it is.

I am not going into details now. I have about reached the conclusion, however, that in the very near future, if nobody else does, I shall state some things that have come to my attention. If the people of this country knew the lack of ships that are absolutely essential for the successful prosecution of this war that exists to-day and is likely to exist for many months in the future, they would be appalled; and yet I do not believe they will realize it until they are told the facts by those who know what the conditions are.

I am one of those who believe that the people of this country, when they do know what they must do, will do it. I am one of those who believe that this country will not be discouraged by the magnitude of the task that may confront it. I am one of those who believe that the people of this country will not give up because of the tremendous sacrifice that the actual conditions may impose upon them. I believe that a knowledge of the facts, a knowledge of what is necessary, a knowledge of the power that they must exert, a knowledge of the sacrifice that they must make in men and money, will nerve the people to make the sacrifice, and that they are not doing what must be done simply because they do not realize the needs of this country in this tremendous contest in which it is engaged.

I know that there seems to be a policy, and seems to have been, not only with reference to our own country but with reference to those who are fighting as we are fighting, to conceal from the people the real situation. I may be mistaken. I do not want to do anything that will discourage our people; I do not want to do anything or say anything that will lend comfort and aid to the enemy; but it seems to me that that policy should not be longer continued. I have not any doubt but that the enemy know the situation better than our own people know it. They know where our armies are better than the people of this country know it. They know the number of those armies better than the people of this country know it. They know the lack of ships better than the people of this country know it. They know of the destruction of the world's shipping better than our people know it, and they know how long it is going to take for our shipbuilding program to catch up with the destruction of the world's shipping better than our own people know it.

We need not deceive ourselves into thinking that they do not know these things; but I believe that we are deceiving ourselves in it, and I believe that we are weakening our armies and lessening our strength by failing to know these things and let the people know them.

Mr. President, I want the employees of this Government to do a good day's work for the Government, just as other people are

expected to do a good day's work for their employers; and as I have listened to this debate it has seemed to me that we have really lost sight of the question involved in the provision known as the Borland amendment. We have allowed ourselves to be influenced by the situation that everybody seems to admit with reference to the multitude of employees here and the fact that they probably are not doing a good day's work, and we have allowed that to control our ideas with reference to this particular amendment.

I admit that it looks like there are too many employees here. It is true that when you go about many of the buildings where the departments and bureaus are housed you can hardly get through for the employees that are there, and I admit that they appear to be doing very little work; but, Mr. President, this is not the fault of the employees. They are here, but they are here at the invitation of the Government, and they are here to work, and if work is not furnished them or is not made available for them it is not their fault. Much of the apparent criticism that has been made here, if it is a just criticism against anybody, is a criticism against the heads of the departments and against the administrative officials who are in control, and not against the clerks. If the Secretary of one of the departments has brought too many employees here, that is not any reason why we should reflect upon the employees. If he has brought more men into his different bureaus than can work there efficiently, the employees should not be condemned for that.

Mr. President, one of the main reasons why I object to the Borland amendment is that, presented as it is and coming as it does, it is a reflection, and in my judgment an unjust reflection, upon the employees of the Government. It seems to be assumed that these Government employees are working overtime. There is not any showing to that effect. There was not any showing to any committee. As I understand, the committee of the Senate gave no hearing, although a hearing was asked. I understand that the committee denied the request of the representatives of these employees to have an opportunity to be heard. I am not criticizing the committee, but it seems to me that the committee should have welcomed the opportunity to interrogate these employees and their representatives and find out from them the very basis of their objection to the Borland amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will.

Mr. KING. I am listening with a great deal of interest to what the Senator says; but I do not quite see the logic of his position when he avers that the adoption of the amendment requiring the employees of the Government working in the Agricultural Department to perform at least eight hours a day service is a reflection upon them or their integrity.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why, it assumes that they are refusing to do it, and they are not refusing to do it.

Mr. KING. Is it not merely a recognition of a state of facts which exists, namely, that for a large number of years, notwithstanding the fact that the work of most of the departments has been in arrears, the heads of the departments have not called upon the employees to work in excess of seven hours a day, and that this custom has crystallized into a habit which can only be broken by legislative enactment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, there is not any showing that that is the case. There is not any testimony to that effect. There is not any showing that the employees of the Government object to an eight-hour law. I have not had any objection presented. The main proposition here is that they object to a provision that does not treat everybody alike, treat everybody fairly, and treat all of the employees alike, whether they are in Washington City or outside of Washington City.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, has not the Senator been importuned by various employees of the Government, and has he not seen literature which has been disseminated to a great extent in the city, protesting against any change in the law which would require them to work more than seven hours a day?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have not.

Mr. KING. The Senator's experience is different from mine, then.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I expect I have received what the Senator has in mind. That does not protest against a general eight-hour law at all. It is complaining of the Borland amendment, because it is not fair, because it discriminates. They say, "We do not object to a universal eight-hour law, with a provision for overtime."

Mr. KING. Oh, yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In fact, they do not say that they object to an eight-hour law at all; and this is not an eight-hour law. The Borland amendment is not an eight-hour law—not a bit of it. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] argues for an eight-hour law. I am in favor of an eight-hour law. This

does not fix an eight-hour law. This simply takes the law as we have it, and for the employees in the Agricultural Department, and no others, and for this one year, and no longer, says that they must work not less than eight hours. An eight-hour law, as it is generally understood, at any rate, is a law that says, "You shall not work longer than eight hours."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the amendment I have offered is adopted, will not that entirely limit their average work to eight hours a day? Has the Senator noticed that amendment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; and that amendment struck me as very peculiar.

I do not know of any eight-hour law anywhere, whether applying to governmental or State work or whether applying to private work, that has a provision like that in it. As I heard it read, it simply provides that if the employees are required to work over eight hours you are to keep an account of the overtime and when they have a credit of eight hours they can lay off for a day with pay.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Not necessarily that. They average the eight hours. If they work 10 hours to-day and the work to-morrow does not especially require a longer time, they are allowed two hours at once, and work six hours to-morrow; and as soon as possible they get credit for the two hours of extra work by two hours of reduced work, so as to average the actual tax upon the man or the woman at eight hours.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, it seems to me that the machinery necessary to keep the books that would be required to keep account of all that sort of thing would necessitate the employment of a lot more clerks down here.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Would it be greater than would be required to keep the record so as to make the extra pay?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, Mr. President, the employees do not ask for extra pay.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not inquiring what the employees ask. I am seeking to find out what I think is best.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, that is not the basis upon which this legislation is being framed, and that has not been the basis upon which this argument has been presented here. It has been presented upon the theory that the employees want this and that; and the impression, at any rate, that has been given to my mind is unjust to the employees. The argument has been based upon the theory that the employees are objecting to working eight hours a day, when the fact is that there is not any objection found anywhere to their working eight hours a day.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask the Senator to pardon me for just a moment.

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to read from one of these statements to which the Senator from Utah has referred.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator must not state that I am referring to one of the statements that he holds in his hand and which he is reading, because what I refer to may be entirely different from the statement which the Senator is about to read to the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If it is, I hope the Senator will correct me, because I assume that we have all received about the same things. I do not think these employees have brought to me anything different from what they have brought to the Senator from Utah.

Here is what they say:

Federal employees are desirous of rendering their full measure of patriotic service in the present war emergency. They have no objection to working, in accordance with existing law, any number of hours considered necessary by the President and the heads of the executive departments without any compensation for overtime.

Mr. President, that is the attitude of these Government employees. What they do object to is being singled out by legislation as slackers and nonpatriotic when the facts are just to the contrary.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator pardon me for suggesting that the House of Representatives to-day has passed—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, Mr. President, I make the point of order that, under the rules of this body, the Senator is not permitted to refer to what has taken place in the other House.

Mr. KING. I did not know but that the Senator—

Mr. JONES of Washington. That would not influence me at all.

Mr. KING. I know that it would not influence the Senator; but I also know that the Senator would not say that one class of employees has been singled out and discriminated against, when the Senator, as a just man, knows that another branch of the Government has enacted a provision requiring the employees provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill to work eight hours a day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, we are not considering that proposition. That proposition, wherever it is and whatever it is is not here.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, if we pass the Borland amendment we pass it as it applies to the Agricultural appropriation bill, and it goes into effect in the Agricultural Department. Now, if the knowledge comes to us from the other branch of Congress that they are applying the same rule as proposed here in the Borland amendment, and that a similar provision will be placed in other bills just as it is in this bill, then, if we fail to agree to the Borland amendment here, will not the Senator be in a position to say that inasmuch as we did not enact it in this bill we must not enact it in the next House bill that comes over? Then there would be the same distinction that the Senator is arguing now. He refers to the fact that this is separate, and applies only to one set of employees. The same argument can be made if the Borland amendment is not adopted here, but is put on the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, that is not an argument that ought to have weight here. The Senate is considering one proposition, and one alone.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand that the House has just applied the same rule to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I thought we had a rule in this body that made it out of order to refer to what has taken place in another body.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think it does—not in that way.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But Senators have overlooked it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that is information that it is entirely proper to give.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] just made the same suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was called out for a second, and I regret that I repeated it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled on that question.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not making that point. I am just suggesting it, that is all.

Mr. President, this simply illustrates the imperfections of this way of trying to legislate. If the hours of labor of these employees ought to be changed they ought to be changed in a logical, straightforward, legislative kind of a way. We have a general statute controlling their hours of labor, and how the compensation of our employees shall be computed, and all that sort of thing. If it is desired to change that law, let us change it in a legislative way. Let us not do in a roundabout way what we seem to be unable to do directly.

The Borland amendment does not pretend to be legislation. It is simply a limitation upon how the money appropriated in this bill shall be spent. Well, Mr. President, if we want to do what most of the Senators have argued, let us do it, and do it squarely. I will not make a point of order against a legislative provision to this bill that will govern, in a proper sort of way, all of the employees of the Government. If it is deemed best to have such legislation, I would welcome it; and, Mr. President, I venture to say that the Government employees will not object to legislation that is deemed wise by Congress if it is put in such a way as to affect everybody alike. But as I see it, one of the main objections to having this legislation come up in this sort of way at this time is that it is an unjustifiable reflection upon the employees of the Government. It comes here without any suggestion from a departmental head that any of his employees are refusing to perform the duties that are required of them. No suggestion has been made by anybody that the employees are refusing to comply with the needs of the service. There is no suggestion from anybody that they are refusing to work overtime. Then why should we reflect upon them?

I think they have a right to resent it. I would feel exactly the same way myself, and I think I would have a right to feel that way. When I knew that I was doing my duty, when I



knew that I was working overtime and was glad to do it, and that I was ready at the request of my chief to work as many hours as he might require, I would resent having it suggested that it was necessary, by means of legislation, to compel me to work overtime. I think they have a right to resent it.

Right here I want to put into the RECORD what has already been put in—the existing law—so that the RECORD may show what it is. I thought I had my papers in the book at that point.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before the Senator reads that, will he permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes. The Senator probably will have time. I have not found where it is.

Mr. KING. I will wait until the Senator finds the reference that he desires to put into the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I had my papers at that point in the book a while ago, but they seem to have gotten misplaced. I have here the provisions that were read yesterday, but there are one or two other provisions in that law that I wanted to read. I will yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I wanted to ask the Senator if he knew why it was that in the face of that specific and unambiguous statute, requiring the chiefs of the various departments to require the employees under them to work eight hours a day when the departments were in arrears, they do not exercise that authority? The statute seems to be mandatory, and it is a matter known to all of us who have had anything to do with the departments that the departments for years have been in arrears. If the chiefs refuse to enforce the statute or, because of the pressure of the employees under them, or the pressure of labor organizations, or pressure from any other source, they refuse to carry out the provisions of that statute, could there be any impropriety for Congress now to legislate upon that matter? Indeed, is it not the duty of Congress to deal with the subject if Congress believes that there ought to be a change in the hours of employment by those who are in Government service?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not know that the heads of the departments have not insisted upon their employees working overtime. Apparently Congress has not made any investigation, and Congress has not tried to find out, but if the heads of the departments have not been doing it, that can not be charged up to the clerks. There is not any showing anywhere that the departmental heads have failed or refused to comply with the law because of pressure either on the part of the clerks or upon the part of outside organizations. If they have they have shown themselves to be unfit for the jobs that they hold. But that ought not to be charged even by intimation unless some showing is made that that has occurred, and that pressure has been brought upon the heads of departments to prevent them from requiring the clerks to work all the time that is necessary.

I am going to reread the provision of the law, so that it may appear here:

Hereafter it shall be the duty of the heads of the several executive departments, in the interest of the public service, to require of all clerks and other employees, of whatever grade or class, in their respective departments, not less than seven hours of labor each day, except Sundays and days declared public holidays by law or Executive order.

Now, that limits the minimum day to seven hours and makes it the duty of the departmental heads to require them to work seven hours. The further provision in the law that I take it was to meet or at any rate would meet the emergency that confronts us now and that may have confronted us for some time, and that meets very largely the argument of those who urge the necessity of this legislation at this time, is as follows:

Hereafter it shall be the duty of the head of each executive department to require monthly reports to be made to him as to the condition of the public business in the several bureaus or offices of his department at Washington, and in each case where such reports disclose that the public business is in arrears, the head of the department in which such arrears exist shall require, as provided herein, an extension of the hours of service to such clerks or employees as may be necessary to bring up such arrears of public business.

Mr. President, I think that is a section of the law that can not by any stress of construction be held to leave it really discretionary with the head of the department. I do not think by any rule of construction the word "shall" can be construed to "may," so that it imposes upon the heads of the departments the duty of requiring monthly reports to show how the business is. Then, if they find business is in arrears they are required to compel the clerks to work overtime, and there is no limit. The clerks are willing to do it. Their representatives say they are willing to work as many hours as the heads of the departments may require them to work and as they may deem necessary for the public service, and there has been no suggestion from any source that they are refusing to do it.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. KING. I was wondering if the heads of the departments had not placed a construction upon the section to which the Senator has just invited our attention which restricted its meaning very much more than the interpretation placed upon it by the distinguished Senator. If he will pardon me, I will just invite his attention to the words I have in mind, namely:

*Provided, That the heads of the departments may, by special order, stating the reason, further extend the hours of any clerk or employee in their departments, respectively.*

Has not that language been so construed by the heads of the departments as to require that a special reason should be given to each individual employee or clerk whenever that employee was required to work in excess of 7 hours per day; that they have not felt they could make a general order sweeping in character and covering all the employees under them but relied upon the application of some individual and felt that the order must extend only to the individual?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will ask the Senator from Utah if he knows that the department has done that?

Mr. KING. All I know is from my observation and from current rumor and the statement made that the heads of the departments have not required them to work in excess of seven hours.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But has the Senator had any statement as to why they have not done it?

Mr. KING. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have not either.

Mr. KING. But in view of the fact that the Senator was construing this act in the way that his language implied, I was wondering if he had investigated to determine whether the department had placed a narrower construction upon the section than that placed upon it by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I have not made any investigation of that kind. It has not seemed necessary to me to do it. I do not believe that any Senator will construe that paragraph any differently from what I have construed it, and from the way it reads, and if any department head has construed it differently we ought to get after that department head and not after the clerks. The clerks are not responsible for any such construction as that.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Washington said a few moments ago that he favors a general eight-hour day for the departments in Washington. Am I correct in that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am in favor of an eight-hour day generally.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator mean a minimum eight-hour day or a maximum eight-hour day?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am in favor of an eight-hour day, and when I say that my idea of an eight-hour day is that they will work eight hours and no more except under some extraordinary emergency or demand.

Mr. CUMMINS. The point that is made by the Senator from Washington is one that has bothered me more than any other in considering this subject, namely, that we are legislating here for the employees of a single department. There is an element of injustice about that which must appeal to everyone. I take it the difficulty the Senator from Washington finds in making a general provision of law in this respect is the rule that forbids amendments to appropriation bills unless they are germane.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that will be the difficulty in legislating on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think I can point out to the Senator how that difficulty can be avoided. I am with him in this respect: I believe in an eight-hour day. I would rather see a maximum eight-hour day than a minimum eight-hour day, but I think all the employees in the departments in Washington ought to work eight hours. If an amendment were offered now to this provision to the effect that it should not take effect until the President certified that a similar provision had been enacted in regard to all the departments in Washington, we could reach the result that seems to be very desirable, notwithstanding the rule that an amendment specifically extending this provision to all departments might be vulnerable to objection.

I desire to suggest that to the Senator from Washington, because I think it is a thing we ought to do. I think we ought to amend the so-called Borland amendment by providing that it shall not take effect until the President shall certify that a

similar provision is effective with regard to all the departments in Washington. It is within our power to pass a law which shall become effective upon the happening of a certain event in the future, and in this instance the event would be similar legislation with regard to all departments.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That would make it very much more acceptable, of course.

Mr. BORAH. May I make a suggestion?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I understand the House has already passed the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and in it has incorporated a provision providing for an eight-hour day. It seems to me that in all probability all the appropriation bills will have been passed by the House and sent to this body before we get through with this debate.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me to suggest that the legislative appropriation bill which has just passed the House covers practically all the employees of the Government outside the Agricultural Department?

Mr. BORAH. I understand it is a general provision.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has just called attention to the same fact the Senator from Utah called attention to a while ago and that the Senator from Georgia called attention to a little later, and that probably another Senator will call attention to later on. I thought I might find the rule that prohibits our reference to what has taken place in another body. I am not familiar with the rules, and I am not able to find it. I understand, however, that we have such a rule, and I have the authority of my friend from Utah [Mr. Smoot] to that effect.

Mr. McCUMBER. I heard the Senator also state that there is some rule against a reference to what was done in the House. I assert there is no such rule whatever.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is a controversy between the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Utah on that point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is with the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will show it to me, I will be convinced.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I said I understood there was such a rule. I confess my lack of familiarity with the rules.

Mr. BORAH. I think the suggestion is found alone in Jefferson's Manual—

Mr. GALLINGER. That is where it is.

Mr. BORAH. Which has long since been superseded, as well as all the other teachings of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We lay the blame on Thomas Jefferson, while we relieve our own rules from that censure. I will not question the right of any Senator when he comes in later on to call my attention to what it is said has occurred in another body to-day.

Mr. President, if we pass this legislation as it is proposed it will only last for a year, and we will have this same thing to thrash over again. So why not take it up in the right kind of a way? If we want to legislate, let us legislate.

Why does not some one propose a legislative provision that will be law not only for this year but for next year, and why leave to the heads of the departments the discretion that we have left in the other law that some Senators do not seem to think the departments are going to exercise? Why tempt them further to violate their oath of office and neglect their duty and then come in here and try to lay all the blame upon the clerks?

Mr. REED. Do I understand that on the legislative appropriation bill the House has adopted an amendment similar to the provision in the bill now pending?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think so.

Mr. REED. I think it ought to be understood that the parliamentary situation there is such that a separate vote must be had upon that amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As there is no restriction, apparently, against stating what has taken place in the other House there certainly is not any restriction against prophesying what will take place in the House when a separate vote is had on this amendment. From the vote upon a division there, which I saw, I am inclined to think that the Borland amendment would carry on the legislative appropriation bill by a larger majority than it had before.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the reason why the heads of the departments do not require the reports that are mentioned in the statute the Senator has read, and thus require extra hours

from the clerks, arises from the fact that it is the fashion now whenever the head of a department or bureau thinks he wants more clerks they simply advertise in the newspapers and they come here in droves. Hence they do not need to require clerks to perform more labor; they have so many of them now that they really do not know what to do with them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It looks like that is the course of procedure.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the procedure. They advertise for them now.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But that does not justify legislating in this way in reference to the clerks.

Now, just a word or two about the suggestion made by the Senator from Utah with reference to the 30 days' leave. It seems to be advanced as an argument here in favor of this legislation that they have 30 days' leave with pay and 30 days' sick leave. Here is the law with reference to that in this same section:

*Provided, further,* That the head of any department may grant 30 days' annual leave with pay in any one year to each clerk or employee.

That does not say that they shall do it; and the department has not construed it as meaning that they shall give the employees 30 days' leave. The Senator from Utah says they have. Here is what the Agricultural Department, the department we are now specifically considering, has done according to a statement that is given to me, of course by the representatives of the employees, but they give the quotation and I have not any doubt that they quote it correctly. They say "the following regulation of the Department of Agriculture has been made." Now I quote:

Leave of absence not a right but a favor: Leave of absence may be granted to employees of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with these regulations when such leave can be taken without detriment to the service. Leave of absence is a privilege and not a legal right.

Leave revocable: Leave of absence may be revoked at any time and the employee ordered to return to duty before its expiration should the exigencies of the service require it.

The whole matter rests in the discretion of the department. If the departments have not wisely exercised the discretion we have given to them then the departmental heads are to blame and not the clerks.

Now, what are the facts with reference to these leaves? I have a statement here which was prepared on behalf of these employees, but they say it has been prepared by the authority of the department in which they give the amount of annual leave. They say:

The records of the Department of Agriculture show that the employees of that department in one year gave to the Government 20,181 days of service which it was their privilege to take as annual leave. This is an average of 5.2 days per person per year. That is to say, the 3,881 employees in Washington who were privileged to take 30 days' annual leave used on an average only 24.8 days each.

I venture to say if the exigencies of the service require it and the departmental heads require it of these employees they will cheerfully work practically all the days that the department under the law may grant them leave.

Then, under the sick leave:

The amount of sick leave used by these employees is also worth noting, in view of the representations of Mr. BORLAND that the sick leave privilege is abused. The maximum allowance for sick leave is 15 days, which, only in the discretion of the Secretary, may be extended to 30 days. But the 3,881 employees of the Department of Agriculture in Washington used on an average only 5.5 days each.

I think that is a splendid record when it shows that these employees only used in a year five and one-half days sick leave.

Mr. President, there are very few employees from the State of Washington down here. I am not interested in this matter on account of them. I have a letter here, however, from one of them, a part of which I am going to read. The writer states that he does not belong to the union; he states that he does not care particularly about the union; but he does object to the reflection that is cast upon his patriotism and upon his willingness to serve his country by legislation proposed in this way. He says:

I personally know of any number of employees in the Department of Agriculture who work over that number of hours half of the time, but I can only swear as to what I do myself.

I have never been asked to work overtime, but when I have certain monthly work to do I have been working overtime each day for periods of about 12 days each month. During the week and a half before Christmas I averaged about 13 hours per day, and that includes Sundays, too. My work, as you know, is operating a multigraph—setting type, etc.—the hardest office work possible for the eyes. I would be willing to keep that up but for the order I received from an eye specialist to the contrary.

He does not object to doing this extra work if necessary. He has been doing it. He has been doing it half the month, and is doing it even without request from the departmental head,



but he is doing it simply because the work of the office required it and demanded it.

I want to say, Mr. President, in my judgment, that is largely the spirit of the great mass of Government employees.

Mr. President, I am not opposing this Borland amendment because I want the employees of the Government to work less. I want them to do their work just as every other Senator wants them to do their work. I sympathize with very many of the suggestions with reference to the wearing character of some of the work made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] yesterday, but I believe they could very well under the circumstances work eight hours a day. Yet as I said, and as the Senator from Missouri said yesterday, there are certain classes of work that if a person works eight hours day after day and day after day will make him a physical wreck much sooner than it would to work 10, 12, or 14 hours out of doors.

Mr. President, I have worked on a farm. We hear a great deal here with reference to the farmer. The farmer has to bear lots of burdens, and he is made the excuse for a whole lot of argument and all that sort of thing. The farmer does not seek that. He does not ask us to base our action upon legislation here entirely upon his condition. We want to treat him justly and fairly, and he does not ask us to treat others unjustly or unfairly because we may treat him unjustly and unfairly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I make a suggestion there?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the law as it now stands the head of any department may require an employee to work as long as a farmer works.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was just going to give a little personal experience as far as I am concerned. I have worked on a farm. I have worked from 4 o'clock in the morning until 9 o'clock at night, and I have run a typewriter from 8 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon. I want to say I will take the work on the farm from 4 o'clock in the morning until 9 o'clock at night for a week or a month or a summer in preference to running a typewriter from 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon, six days out of the week, and I will come through the summer in a great deal better condition by working on a farm than in the other work.

Mr. President, when I say that I do not say that the farmer ought to have to work from 4 o'clock until 9 o'clock at night. I wish he did not; but one thing is certain, that a farmer can not make very much out of his farm unless he does it. Now, that is true. Of course farm labor is much different now from what it was a few years ago. You do not go on farms now and find farm laborers working from 4 o'clock in the morning until 9 o'clock at night. You hire a man to work on a farm and he works 10 hours a day, and that is all.

Mr. REED. When the Senator was working from 4 o'clock in the morning until 9 o'clock at night, of course, that did not apply on rainy days and it did not apply—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; when it was raining I had to get in the barn and shell corn and do things of that sort.

Mr. REED. It did not apply all through the winter.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I went to school in the winter.

Mr. REED. There is a time when farm work lets up in its hours. I know that because I have done a little of it myself. The Senator is talking about the farmer. To-day the farm laborer gets, as I understand it, approximately \$60 a month, his board, his room, and his washing, and then gets a horse to go to town on Sunday. Is there any \$100 a month clerk in Washington who gets \$60 a month net out of his salary?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not contending that the clerks here are not paid well compared with laborers on a farm; but I am contending much in line with what the Senator from Missouri said yesterday that when you consider the character of work a great many of these people do I would a great deal rather do the work on a farm than do what they do and be held to it the hours that under the law they should be held to it.

But the main objection I have to legislating in this way is the injustice of it, the discriminatory character of it, and the reflection, in my judgment the unjust reflection, coming as it does, upon the employees of the Government. In my judgment, they are just as faithful employees as can be found anywhere, and if there is any censure to be imposed upon anybody it should be imposed upon the heads of departments who have not done what the law gives them the right to do and makes it their duty to do. When you say that the farmer has to work 10, 16, and 18 hours and that others have to work that time, you can point to the law and say that the department heads may require these people to work all the time that is necessary to do the Government's work, but if we want to legislate, and

ought to legislate, in reference to this matter let us do it in a regular way. Let us make it permanent legislation, not year for year and year for year and piecemeal and piecemeal. Let the committee investigate the matter and ascertain what the defects are and the reason for them and frame the law in a way that will not only be just to the Government but just to these employees.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the heads of the departments concerned have authority to require more hours of work from the employees in the classification named if they wish. I think it is an effort to pass up to Congress the burden of requiring the actual work to be performed instead of the heads of departments doing it. It is not the first time that a disagreeable task has been passed to Congress by the executive departments, but I decline, for myself, to become a party to the transaction.

I am not going to discuss the question whether these clerks are working overtime now or undertime. That is not my problem. The white man's burden in the Senate here is not to relieve the heads of departments from their difficulties. They have power; let them exercise that power. If they do not want to exercise it they ought not to ask Congress to compel them to do it, and that is in effect what this provision would do.

There is a provision, however, in addition to that. On one occasion the Council of National Defense announced the principle on which we were to be guided while we were in the war. The Council of National Defense is the vocal expression of the Government on this question. I have heard considerable criticism every time there has been a strike at some place of a number of employees, some of whom probably are not informed as to their patriotic duties, as well as others, that they were breaking this general principle that was laid down, and I think they were. It is just as reprehensible for the employer to break this announced principle as it is for the Government or for Congress to announce a new rule.

The Council of National Defense has deemed this subject of such consequence that it created a committee on labor, substantially directed and controlled by representatives of the largest national unions, which, after due deliberation, issued, through its executive committee, a statement apparently intended to declare certain fundamental policies of industrial relationship which should apply during the period of the war. Perhaps the most important sentence of this statement was the declaration that "neither employers nor employees shall endeavor to take advantage of the country's necessities to change existing standards." Differences of interpretation and opinion led to a further amplification and explanation and accompanying declarations, which were indorsed by the Council of National Defense.

These were to the effect that standards of safety and service established by State or Federal law should remain in effect.

It is proposed now by this amendment, which is known as the Borland amendment, to change the hours of service of a certain class of employees who are embraced in the terms of the amendment. That is a violation of this general principle laid down by the Council of National Defense. It applies, it is true, more particularly to private industrial relations, but there is no difference in the good faith that would be required between the private industrial relations existing between the employees in the departments and the Government. If it is a good rule for a shipyard or for a steel mill having industrial employees, it is equally a good rule, and it should apply, to employees in the departments of the Government. Good faith would require that we adhere to it. We have laid it down.

We have heard many just criticisms here and elsewhere upon industrial employees who struck and refused to abide by this wholesome principle. It is said they ought not to tender the war as an excuse to change existing standards of service. I think that is true. If criticism is to be meted out to these striking employees, how will Congress escape the same criticism when we establish another rule here to govern these employees from that of existing law? We can not meet it. We can not announce this principle when a strike is employed in an industrial establishment if we ourselves violate the principle. We shall be estopped to urge that as an equitable rule to be followed during the continuance of the war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], as modified, to the text of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, line 16, after the word "day," it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That hereafter record shall be kept of all hours of daily work in excess of eight hours by each employee; and employees who have worked extra hours shall be allowed an equal number of hours without work with full pay, and the credit for overtime shall be given as soon as practicable after the extra work has been performed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to state this case with reference to the eight-hour question. The eight-hour contest was a fight to reduce the hours of labor, with extra pay for overtime. The Borland amendment is an effort to increase the

hours of labor without pay of any kind for overtime. It is absolutely the antithesis of the eight-hour day contest. The eight-hour day contest was started inside labor ranks to shorten its hours and get pay for overtime. This is a fight from the outside to extend the hours of labor without anything whatsoever for the extended time or for any time in excess of eight hours. It is a mockery to compare such a proposal with what is usually called the eight-hour movement.

A great many economists here and at the other end of the Capitol are pretending that they are supporting this bill in the interest of the Treasury. They have singled out the old clerks in the old departments, most of whom have been here many years, to make them the object of legislative economy. They have undertaken to prove that there is a lack of economy by calling to our attention a vast influx of clerks into Washington who, they say, "toil not, neither do they spin." If there be any such clerks you will not find them in the old departments. You will find them in the new-fangled bureaus. I object to cutting down the pay of the old clerk who has been in Washington doing the business of the Government because there may be too many new clerks employed in the new bureaus that this Congress has recently set up and has recklessly and wantonly refused to regulate.

Mr. President, we are strange creatures in this world, and especially in this Senate. We have spent two or three days here declaiming about the necessity of compelling these clerks to work eight hours and about their wages being too high for a seven-hour day. Statesmen have worked themselves into a frenzy; they have gone charging up and down the aisles talking about clerks who work only seven hours and who get \$100 a month; and yet only a few days ago we voted some salaries of \$12,000 a year, and expressly provided that those who were drawing the salaries should not be even required to give all of their time to the Government!

Moreover, we have set up bureaus here without any regulation whatever as to wages or hours of labor. Salaries are being paid and money is being appropriated absolutely without regard to the question of economy.

Mr. President, while we are complaining about the salaries of the \$100-a-month clerks, and while we are complaining because they are not compelled to work as a minimum more than seven hours a day, there are gentlemen traveling up and down the country, with huge expense accounts at their command, who are drawing four and five and six thousand dollars a year, and the Senate has never even paused to inquire into the facts. The other day when the Food Administration came here asking for \$1,750,000 of additional money, and it was disclosed that it proposed to increase its expenses 200 per cent between now and the month of June, there was not a whimper from any of the economists in the Senate. Every one of them sat mum, and you could not get an inquiry into what was to be done with the money, although that Food Administration had cost the Government in less than 10 months of time over \$8,250,000, and was asking an increase, which I have included in the \$10,000,000 estimate, of \$1,750,000, upon the express claim that it proposed to increase its expenses 200 per cent. According to that estimate, we may expect to pay 20 or 30 million dollars during the next 12 months. We go about complaining here and declaiming there because some woman who may be supporting an invalid husband or an invalid child or an old father or an old mother, only being required to work seven hours a day; we insist that for her \$100 a month she shall work eight hours as a minimum, with no pay for overtime; but we say nothing about the enormous salaries men receive who have been appointed by the Food Administration or Fuel Administration without regulation by law and without confirmation by the Senate. Here are a few gentlemen who hold offices unknown to the law. We do not even know what their titles indicate. All we know is that they hold their authority of office by grace of Mr. Hoover, who selects the men, prescribes their duties, assigns their titles, arranges their expenses, and mayhap pays their rents. The latter I can not affirm with certainty.

In the Food Administration grain-corporation's force appears the following holders of what may be justly denominated Hoover plums:

William Beatty, comptroller	\$6,000
G. Roy Hall, traffic expert	6,000
F. S. Staley, general auditor	6,000
John D. Shanahan, grain expert	5,000
Walter I. Bean, chief accountant	4,000
Claude N. Hitchcock, office manager	4,000
A. W. Erick, correspondent	4,000
C. H. McLaughlin, chief clerk, export department	3,900

That is at Washington. Then, at Baltimore, Md.—

Herbert Sheridan, assistant to second vice president	\$5,000
--	---------

What is an assistant to a second vice president?

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. REED. I will.

Mr. KING. I was going to ask what organization has a vice president, a first vice president, and a second vice president.

Mr. REED. They appear to be in some way attached to the grain corporation of the Food Administration. Further than that I do not know; the Senator from Utah does not know; the Senate does not know; and the Senate does not care. These salaries are being paid out by the sacred Food Administration. Inquiry is insolent. [Laughter.] I continue reading—

John J. Frederick, assistant office manager [over at Baltimore]—\$2,400

Then at Philadelphia, Pa.—I wonder if any part of this patronage fell to the Senator from Pennsylvania—we find—

J. C. Morris	\$3,300
Elison Graff	2,700
L. M. Elchman	2,500
Fred S. Griffin	2,400

Mr. VARDAMAN. Has that anything to do with Hog Island? [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. No; the methods may be similar, but the locations are different. [Laughter.]

The statement which I am reading only embraces a small part of the Food Administration's pay roll. I read:

Buffalo, N. Y.:  
Edgar B. Black, assistant to second vice president—\$3,600

That is the second assistant this vice president has got. His first assistant gets \$5,000 a year and the second assistant gets \$3,600 a year. It seems to me that is class legislation. I think that Buffalo, N. Y., has a right to complain that it is being discriminated against in favor of Baltimore, Md. Then at Buffalo, N. Y., we also find—

James A. Stevenson, cashier	\$3,000
Portland, Ore.: Otto Kettenbach, assistant to second vice president	5,100
S. A. Turner, cashier	3,600
A. M. Scott, assistant cashier	2,700

Mr. VARDAMAN. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. REED. I am reading a list taken from the official report of Mr. Hoover?

Mr. KIRBY. Who fixes the salaries?

Mr. REED. Mr. Hoover fixes them, or I suppose he fixes them, for he is fixing everything else; he is fixing the price of the farmer's wheat, and in so doing is willfully violating the law of the land; he is fixing the price of the farmer's pork, and in so doing is willfully violating the law of the land; he is fixing the size of the farmer's potatoes, and in so doing is violating the law of the land; he is fixing America to lose this war by cutting down the production of the farmers, and in so doing is violating the law of common sense; he is, in his capacity as an American officer, fixing the prices of American farm products, which he then buys in his capacity as purchasing agent for foreign countries, and in so doing violated the precept "No man can serve two masters." Likewise he violates the laws which forbid an agent to act for parties having antagonistic interests. Secretary McAdoo recently charged Hoover with being the sole purchasing agent of the allies. The statement remains undenied.

A protest is growing among the farmers. They are coming here from across the continent to protest before the Committee on Agriculture. They are telling us serious facts, that must be heeded at an early day or next winter we will have bread tickets and meat tickets where we might have plenty. As bad as was the Garfield closing order, the activities of the Food Administration are even worse, for the Garfield closing order was limited to 14 days, while the Food Administration is imposing restrictive measures that are going to cut down farm production throughout the year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. KING. In view of the fact that the Senator has just mentioned the activities of Mr. Hoover and his department, I am interested in knowing whether or not the investigation before the committee supports the statement which is now being put out in the newspapers that the Hoover administration has increased the production of meat and of pork; that some 6,000,000 or more of cattle have been reared because of the activities of this department, and I do not remember the number of millions more of hogs, as the result of the work of this administration. According to the testimony, is there anything in support of those statements?

Mr. REED. The Senator can not ask that question with a straight face. A Senator coming from the great West knows that that statement is utterly silly. The beef cattle of this country increased how many head?

Mr. KING. Six million and some odd thousand.



Mr. REED. Six million head since August 10, when Mr. Hoover took office! It takes three years to grow a steer, and Bob Ingersoll once irreverently said that there was one thing God Almighty could not do, and that was to make a four-year-old steer in five minutes. [Laughter.] I am not ready to believe Mr. Hoover could produce 6,000,000 in six months, although I am reminded he has referred to himself as the "miracle man."

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. SHERMAN. I suggest that the authorities got it mixed up with a healthy shote. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Why, Mr. President, I also saw the statement made that the hogs had all grown bigger; that they were bigger now than they were ever before in the world. [Laughter.] This is the fact about the hog business: They are not any bigger than they ever were before in the world, but the hogs that are just now being marketed are pitifully small. Brood sows are being hauled to market to butcher because the farmer can not afford to feed \$1.80 corn into \$15 a hundred hogs; but there was a short time back a few days when the hog run to the market was very heavy—not unprecedented, but heavy—the average being about 230 pounds. The reason for that was—not Hoover, but the railroad embargo—transportation could not be readily obtained for hogs, and hogs had to be held on the farm for some two or three weeks longer than usual and they had to be fed corn, and so increased somewhat in weight.

What is there about Mr. Hoover's beneficent influence that will make a hog grow? [Laughter.] It is a good deal like that story we heard about the fuelless days releasing 480 ships and sending them across the ocean. As a matter of fact, that number was arrived at by claiming credit for every ship that sailed from every port of America, except from three southern ports, when, as everybody knows, nearly all the ships would have sailed if the order for the fuelless days had never been issued. The truth is that there was a net reduction in the number of ships in the ports of the whole of the United States of just 56. Somebody said that figures will not lie, but it must be conceded they become beautifully confused.

I am digressing; but mark what I am telling you. Though you may say I am "harping on my daughter," unless there is a reversal of the policy which fixes the price of coal at the mines so that the mines can not run at top speed, unless there is a reversal of the kind of policy that is about to close the mines of Colorado, according to the statement of the Senator from Colorado—

Mr. THOMAS. That has closed them.

Mr. REED. "That has closed them," the Senator tells me; there will be suffering in our homes; there will be a shutting down of our great industries next winter; there will be more fuelless days and more brainless days. Unless there is a reversal of the policy that interferes with production and penalizes the farmer, and, to use a slang expression, "makes the farmer the goat," there will be a crop deficiency next summer that will next winter bring the most serious consequences.

If we expect to win this war, we must win it by production. The energy of these boards and these individuals apparently has been directed to restrict production by endeavoring to restrict the prices of the men who produce. It is a mistaken policy; it is a foolish policy; it is a policy that, if not abandoned, will lose us this war. Whatever else we do, we ought to produce an abundance of foodstuffs and we ought to produce an abundance of coal. These two great products are essential to the winning of this war.

If I may further claim the attention of the economists of Congress who want to cut down the salary of the pale-faced woman who is working over a set of books in one of the departments or who is working on an adding machine or a comptometer, I beg to call attention to some more of these salaries of the food and fuel departments:

New Orleans, La.:	
H. L. Daunoy, assistant to the second vice president.....	\$4, 800
Minneapolis, Minn.:	
C. L. Bostwick, general officer manager.....	5, 000
F. G. Holbrook, head of the wheat distribution.....	3, 600
E. H. Conkey, chief inspector.....	3, 000
Duluth, Minn.:	
E. A. Forsyth.....	5, 000
I do not know what he does, but he is stationed at Duluth, the town that Proctor Knott discovered and at the same time immortalized. [Laughter.]	
J. E. McGregor.....	\$5, 000
Kansas City, Mo.:	
H. J. Smith.....	5, 000
E. F. Beyer.....	5, 000

I do not know what he does, but I think he must be another assistant to the second vice president. [Laughter.] There are seven names of persons in the list who, I have discovered, are assistants to the second vice president.

Now let us go to the pay roll at the national headquarters:

Ben S. Allen..... \$4, 800

Who is Ben S. Allen? Probably a very nice gentleman. He was a representative of the Associated Press, at London, England; became the private secretary of Mr. Hoover; accompanied Mr. Hoover to the United States; and is now drawing \$4,800 a year. I do not know what his duties are—whether he is still representing the Associated Press, or whether he is assistant to the second vice president, or whether he is just Mr. Hoover's private secretary; but his salary is \$4,800.

Alice C. Boughton..... \$2, 400

Here is a lady drawing twice the salary that the clerks in the departments draw. Which one of the economists in the Senate rose up to protest against that? [Laughter.] Why, when I asked that there go out of the deficiency appropriation bill the other day \$1,750,000 to be used in addition to the seven and a half million dollars that has already been squandered, you did not vote then for economy, that was not economy day. That was Hoover day. Now, there is nothing to oppose this rare bit of economy but a few poor clerks, and there are plenty of gallant gentlemen willing to charge the breastworks that are defended by the helpless. [Laughter.]

I continue reading:

Marion E. Bradbury..... \$3, 000

I wonder if she is doing any more difficult labor than some of the women who have grown gray-haired working in the departments. There is not a protest, though, on account of her salary.

W. H. Buck..... \$2, 700

I do not know what Buck does, except that he is at the national headquarters.

Dallas S. Burch..... \$2, 502

Just why they add that \$2 I do not know; perhaps it is for overtime. I do not know; but there it is in the report.

Alexander Cairns..... \$5, 184

It does not tell what Alexander does. I only know that he has got his arm in the Government Treasury down to the \$5,000 notch, and then \$184 farther in.

Julian S. Carr..... \$2, 880

Stephen Chase..... 3, 000

E. F. Cullen..... 5, 004

Leonard Dawson..... 2, 760

E. Dana Durand—

A man that parts his name in that way ought to get a very liberal salary. I blush to say that E. Dana gets only \$3,000.

[Laughter.] Mr. GORE. From the Government.

Mr. REED. From the Government. I accept the amendment.

B. F. Durr..... \$2, 808

Thomas Ellis..... 3, 600

J. W. DuB. Gould..... 4, 200

Frank F. Jenks..... 4, 800

Observe Frank F. draws just exactly four times as much as one of these \$1,200 clerks. Of course, he has only one-fourth the necessary expenses in proportion to his salary, but there is not a protest. The economists of the Senate, who bravely reach out to take a few shekels from a lot of poor girls and old ladies, and men with families who can scarcely live on their meager salaries in the departments, hesitated and fell back appalled when asked to stop the raids of Hoover on the Treasury.

Brave boys, brave boys, brave boys all;

And yet, and yet, I can not forget,

That many are brave not at all—

If I may doggerelize an old bit of verse.

Why, these men, as has been suggested to me, are drawing more pay than many officers of the Army who have served 20 years and are now on the firing line; but, then, this is Hoover's. [Laughter.] These are the people that work for the "miracle man." [Laughter.] Perhaps one of them made himself solid by sending out from Hoover's headquarters the circular I once exhibited to the Senate, advising the people that a letter addressed to "The Miracle Man" would be promptly delivered to Mr. Hoover.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I want to suggest to the Senator that the example of the department to which he is just referring seems to have

impregnated some of the other departments. For instance, I observed a short time ago in the newspaper an advertisement put out by the Civil Service Commission in which they stated that they must have immediately 250 accountants for one small branch of the War Department, which already had a large number, and that the compensation was to be from \$3,000 a year to \$6,000 a year. I do not know where they got the authority to pay such salaries, or the authority to advertise for such a large number of employees.

Mr. REED. It is in the air, except when you come to the question of a few pale-faced, and sometimes aged, clerks. Then we are proposing to trim, and do it properly, to adopt the slang expression of the day. But at other places it is a matter of reckless expansion.

"Woe unto the scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites."

Notice I am maintaining a strictly parliamentary position. I speak in the impersonal sense. I employ the article "the" instead of the pronoun. [Laughter.] There is something else in near context, that about straining at gnats and swallowing camels. So you strain at a \$1,200 clerk's salary and swallow a \$5,000-a-year salary, drawn by a gentleman with undisclosed and mysterious duties, which are rendered at some indefinite place for an undetermined period. I read on:

Frank F. Jenks	\$4,800
William E. Kellicott	3,600
Russell M. MacLennan	3,000
William A. McKenzie	3,000
Maj. James Miles	2,700
Irwin S. Osborn	4,800
John S. Pardee	3,600
Raymond Pearl	6,600

Pearls came a little higher than the other—

Mr. KING. Jewels.

Mr. REED. Jewels—I thank the Senator—that we find in the Hoover casket. [Laughter.]

B. Harold Powell	\$4,200
Charles E. Raymond	3,000
Edward F. Treitz	5,400
Bestor R. Walters	3,000
Clinton R. Whitney	3,120

Now we come to a pay roll for the field service. I do not know what is done in this field.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. REED. Yes; certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it proposed in this bill to make these employees of the Government work also eight hours per day?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; these be immune. [Laughter.]

These in the Hoover department are as sacred as cats were in Egypt [laughter], and whosoever ventures to shy a brick in their direction has at once turned upon him as bitter vials of wrath as the priests of Rameses poured upon the impious who disturbed the felines of ancient Thebes.

I read the pay roll in the field service:

Iowa:	
Julianne Doane	\$4,800

Now, I do not know what Julianne does, and I do not know what his or her sex may be, but she or he is drawing a very liberal salary, is drawing as much as four of these old clerks that are working down here trying to support themselves and pay Washington rents and Washington grocery bills; but, of course, there will be no effort to interfere with Julianne. Is not he or she employed in the sacred place? I resume reading:

Nebraska:	
B. V. Parrish	\$3,999.96

Marked down from \$4,000. [Laughter.]

New York:	
Augustin McNally	\$3,189.28
North Carolina:	
John Paul Lucas	3,000.00
Pennsylvania:	
James A. Finley	3,000.00
Rhode Island—	

Here is a female field agent now. There is no doubt about the sex here—

Texas:	
Mrs. Ida S. Harrington	\$3,000
J. R. Babcock	3,000
H. Wirt Steele	5,004

Will the Senator from Texas tell me why he had that extra \$4 added on to his man, or does the Senator from Texas know the gentleman?

Vermont:	
James P. Taylor	\$3,600
West Virginia:	
William Hill	3,000

Now I come to the pay roll in the Fuel Administration. I do not know where these gentlemen work, but somewhere. At least they draw this salary here in Washington—

James B. Edmunds	\$2,600
Cyrus D. Foss, jr.	3,900
Herbert G. Hopkins	3,600
Richard W. Kirtley	3,600
E. R. Sartwell	3,900

Here is the field pay roll, now, for the Fuel Administration:

New York:	
Ellery B. Gordon	\$5,004
Utah:	
Ledyard M. Bailey	3,000

I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah if he knew he had a constituent drawing \$3,000?

Mr. KING. I certainly did not. Having heard his name, I will say, however, that he is a very worthy man, a good Republican, a good man.

Mr. REED. A good Republican and a good man. What was his business? Which particular college did he attend? [Laughter.]

Mr. KING. I have to plead ignorance on that point.

Mr. REED (reading)—

Car Service Bureau:	
John S. Spellman	\$4,200

Now, you may think I have taken a lot of your time in reading this; but here is a list of the employees in a book [exhibiting], principally made up of employees and expense items. I have read you a few out of thousands—out of thousands.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator mean to state that the Food Department in the city of Washington is employing thousands of persons?

Mr. REED. The Food and Fuel Departments together, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, I think I am safe in saying, are employing thousands. Some months ago the Food Administrator stated that he had, I think it was, eleven or twelve hundred clerks here in Washington alone. Why, Mr. President, they rented the entire Gordon Hotel for headquarters, and I put in the Record the other day—and it will be found in one of my speeches—a list of the places where they pay rent in the city of Washington. I have not counted them, but I think there are some 15 or 20. As my colleague suggests, they now have a very large new building. I do not know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars it cost. It is a temporary building. They cut down a lot of beautiful trees in the Mall and put up a temporary shack. Of course it will have to be soon removed.

Not a word is said about these things; but, oh, how we will convince our constituents that we are looking after their interests if we can just go back and say, "Look at what we did to the clerks. See how we have guarded your interests. We have made them work an extra hour every day." [Laughter.] How about these others?

Mr. President, the thing is sickening to me. If we want to economize, let us begin right. Let us begin by placing some restrictions upon the wild extravagance of men who spend money as though it were leaves upon the trees, and as though, to borrow the expression of another, we owned the forests of the world.

Let me state the eight-hour-a-day question once more. I repeat, the eight-hour-a-day fight was a contest to reduce the hours to eight, with extra pay for overtime. The Borland amendment is a fight to increase the hours of labor to eight, with no pay for overtime. They are as different as heat and cold, as light and darkness, as kindness and brutality.

Mr. President, let us permit the heads of the departments to run the departments. Under the present law they must require seven hours; they can require eight hours, or nine hours, or ten hours' work; and the clerks are responding to every demand that is made. Let well enough alone. Not the head of a department has asked for this law—not one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the noes seem to have it. The noes have it, and the amendment is lost.

Mr. GORE. I call for a division.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is not here. I suppose it would not be in order to suggest the absence of a quorum. I should be glad to do so if it is not too late. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is asked for. Those in favor of the amendment will rise and stand until they are



counted. [A pause.] Those opposed will rise. [A pause.] The amendment is lost.

Mr. GORE. I call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are asked for.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, a point of order. It seems to me the Chair has decided the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The Chair has decided it twice.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I made an effort to call for the yeas and nays before the Chair made the announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand that the Senator from Oklahoma sought to do so, and if there is a mistake about it the roll will be called. That is the only fair way in which the Chair can decide the matter.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask that the amendment may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, at the end of line 16, after the word "day," it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

*Provided, That hereafter records shall be kept of all hours of daily work in excess of eight hours by each employee, and employees who have worked extra hours shall be allowed an equal number of hours without work with full pay, and the credit for overtime shall be given as soon as practicable after the extra work has been performed.*

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, was the demand for a roll called seconded?

Mr. REED. There has been no chance yet. It has not been put to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma asks for a yeas-and-nays vote. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. He tells me that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. I therefore feel free to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). Has the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WARSON] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have a general pair with that Senator. I transfer it to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TILLMAN. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] and vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] to my colleague [Mr. PAGE], who is absent, and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. He is paired with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. HARDING. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and vote "yea."

Mr. CALDER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. In view of his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to inquire if the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. STERLING. I have a general pair with that Senator. In his absence, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MYERS. Has the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] and vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (after having voted in the negative). I inadvertently voted without announcing my general pair with the

senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, but because of the transfer announced by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] I am at liberty to vote. I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 31, as follows:

#### YEAS—26.

Beckham	Harding	Nelson	Tillman
Borah	Hardwick	Pomerene	Vardaman
Cummins	Kendrick	Reed	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Gallinger	King	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Gore	Kirby	Smoot	
Gronna	Myers	Thomas	

#### NAYS—31.

Ashurst	Johnson, Cal.	New	Shields
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Smith, Mich.
Fall	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Stone
France	Jones, Wash.	Polindexter	Sutherland
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Robinson	Swanson
Hale	McKellar	Shafroth	Thompson
Henderson	McNary	Sheppard	Wolcott
Hollis	Martin	Sherman	

#### NOT VOTING—38.

Baird	Gerry	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Goff	Nugent	Sterling
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Overman	Townsend
Broussard	James	Owen	Trammell
Calder	Kellogg	Page	Underwood
Chamberlain	La Follette	Penrose	Walsh
Colt	Lewis	Ransdell	Warren
Culbertson	Lodge	Saulsbury	Watson
Fernald	McCumber	Simmons	
Fletcher	McLean	Smith, Md.	

So the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to offer an amendment. In line 12, after the words "District of Columbia," I move to insert the words "or elsewhere," so that it will apply to all the employees of the departments whether in Washington City or anywhere else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. In line 11, page 91, after the word "used," and before the word "to," I move to insert the words "during the existing war."

I know that the war probably may not be over before this money is expended, and yet it may be. This will sustain the principle which I contended for earlier in the discussion of having the provision stand during the existing war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, line 11, after the word "used," the first word in the line, insert the words "during the existing war"; so that if amended it will read:

No part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used during the existing war to pay salaries or for personal services in any department, bureau—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] to strike out lines 10 to 16, inclusive, on page 91.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GORE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] to strike out the paragraph.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "nay."

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]

to the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], and I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I announce the same transfer of my pair that I announced on the last vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). In the absence of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], with whom I have a general pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair as on the former vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], but as he would vote, if present, as I intend to vote I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORE] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is temporarily absent from the Chamber on official business.

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair that I did on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I have already voted, but I neglected to announce the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] to my colleague [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (after having voted in the negative). I also have voted, and I neglected to announce the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL].

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to ask if the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. CURTIS. I have a pair with that Senator, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. CALDER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. I find he is not present, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. GORE. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. OVERMAN. My colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on important business.

Mr. KNOX. I am paired with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (after having voted in the negative). Since voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], to whom I transferred my pair, has entered the Chamber and voted, and I withdraw my vote. I am not able to get a transfer.

Mr. KNOX. I am informed that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], if present, would vote "yea." So I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness in his family.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]; and

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY].

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 29, as follows:

## YEAS—28.

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Smith, Mich.
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Stone
France	Kendrick	Reed	Sutherland
Hale	Knox	Robinson	Swanson
Henderson	McKellar	Sheppard	Thompson
Hollis	McNary	Sherman	Trammell
Johnson, Cal.	Martin	Shields	Wolcott

## NAYS—29.

Beckham	Harding	Nugent	Tillman
Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poinceter	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kenyon	Pomerene	Watson
Fall	King	Shafroth	Weeks
Frellinghuysen	Kirby	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
Gore	Nelson	Smoot	
Gronna	New	Thomas	

## NOT VOTING—38.

Baird	Fletcher	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Gerry	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Goff	Norris	Sterling
Broussard	Hardwick	Overman	Townsend
Calder	Hitchcock	Owen	Underwood
Chamberlain	James	Page	Vardaman
Colt	Kellogg	Penrose	Walsh
Culberson	La Follette	Ransdell	Warren
Curtis	Lewis	Saulsbury	
Fernald	Lodge	Simmons	

So Mr. SHEPPARD's motion was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to move to amend the bill by inserting, after the word "day," in line 16, page 91, a comma and the words "with pay at time and a half time for extra hours." The object of the amendment is simply to put these people upon a common footing with all the laboring men and upon a common footing with what the laboring men have demanded, to wit, an eight-hour day, with time and a half pay for overtime. I might spend three hours talking about it and it would not enlighten the Senate a particle. I just announce what my purpose is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, line 16, after the word "day," insert a comma and the words "with pay at time and a half time for extra hours."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment. I think it is general legislation. You will observe, Mr. President, that the provision in the bill was drawn according to the House rule so as to avoid a point of order. I think the proposition offered by the Senator from Mississippi is legislation and is subject to a point of order. I therefore make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this whole proposition in the bill is new legislation, requiring only eight hours a day of work. My amendment is a limitation of the eight hours, prescribing that if they work over eight hours they shall be paid time and a half for overtime. Unless the entire provision is subject to a point of order my amendment is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. GORE. The Senator, I think, is mistaken. If he will observe the language of the House provision, he will see that it was drawn in order to avoid a point of order in the House. It is a limitation or a direction upon the expenditure of the money appropriated in the bill and is not new legislation in any sense.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not care about the technicalities of the draftsman who drew the bill. The actual fact is that these people can be summoned if the head of the bureau chooses to do it. The only trouble is that the head of the bureau never does choose to require them to work 8 hours, or to work 9 hours, or to work 10 hours, or to work 16 hours; but that is the present law. This provision, from line 10 down to line 16, inclusive, provides that they shall not be summoned to work over eight hours. I have put in an amendment to that which is that they shall be paid time and a half for overtime if they are worked over eight hours.

Mr. President, there can be no honest and sincere objection on parliamentary grounds to the amendment which I have offered to the amendment, if the original amendment itself is in order and the original phraseology of the provision in the bill, no matter who intended something else, is susceptible to an interpretation different from the present practice of the departments. That being the case, my proposition is to provide that while the clerks are being required to work eight hours they shall be paid time and a half for overtime. It is clearly in order if the original provision of the House bill is in order.

Outside of that, Mr. President, what do you want to do with these people? I heard a Senator here the other day talking about them as if they were working in a sweatshop. Now, you and I know better than that. There is no sweatshop about these departments. You can go down to the War Department right now—the most overworked department of the Government—and find three men out of ten in nearly every room rolling cigarettes and two or three more reading newspapers. I have nothing against them; I have many friends in the departments who are working all the time, and working their best; but this absurd, fool talk about sweatshops—Government sweat-



shops—in the city of Washington is a disgrace to the American people and a disgrace to the Senate of the United States ever to have been uttered upon this floor. You know and I know that these employees of the Government are not being overworked.

Now, all I want to do is to put them upon the footing that labor throughout the country seeks. What is labor seeking? An eight-hour-day law with time and a half for overtime, and my amendment will simply give them that—nothing more and nothing less. It does not burden them with extra burdens in comparison with other labor; it does not make a Prætorian home guard in "Rome" of them, as does the present system; and it will do exact justice by all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi desires to put these employees on the same basis as the labor of the country, generally speaking, would he not have to repeal that provision of the law which gives them 30 days' leave at full pay?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from New York mentioned that, for I temporarily forgot it. Even if this amendment is adopted, they will still not be on a level with the balance of the labor of the country. Mr. President, you know and I know and the Senator from New York knows that these employees have, in the first place, 30 days leave each year, regardless—30 days vacation, 30 days recess. I am not opposed to that. I wish that every laboring man in the United States had it. Labor would be very much more efficient if every man who is hard at work had 30 days at some time to go home or to go somewhere else and fish or hunt or rest or do something else; but the ordinary laborer has not got it, and this Prætorian cohort has it.

That is not all. They have 30 days sick leave; and you know you can go around here in the departments and not bankrupt yourself by offering a ten-dollar prize for every employee who does not take his full sick leave. Even I would not be bankrupted if I made that proposition, and the Senator from New York would have his private fortune hardly touched.

There are 60 days that these people have off, and they take the sick leave whether they are sick or not. A man will come around to your office to beg you for a transfer or promotion or something, and you will say to him, "Can you not come back to-morrow?" He will say, "No; I took this off my sick leave," he being as well a man as ever you saw since you were born. So my proposition does not even put them down to the level of ordinary labor. We can leave that to operate upon later.

One of the things that we ought to do is to provide that a man shall not have sick leave unless he is sick. He ought to have the 30 days, and every other laborer in the United States ought to have it. I hope to God to live to see the time when every man who works with his hands or his head inside of four walls shall work only eight hours a day and shall have at least 30 days of vacation during which to rest up and come back to work again. That, however, is not embodied in my amendment and has nothing to do with it. What I am providing for is that these men, while they are working eight hours, shall have time and a half pay for work in excess of eight hours. That is my amendment; it is only fair, and I hope it will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the point of order is to be discussed, let us get to the point of order. The point of order is made against the amendment. The situation is that this bill contains an appropriation for certain clerks and certain employees at so much a year—not by the hour or by the day, but so much a year. The general law is that the heads of departments may require them to work the number of hours they please. It has been the custom to avoid the general law in the past—and it has been sustained by both the House of Representatives and the Senate as not being general legislation—by inserting a clause to the effect that the money shall not be used save under certain conditions. So the rule of the House and the rule of the Senate in reference to general legislation was avoided in this bill by saying that this money should only be paid when the head of the department required the clerk to work eight hours a day on a yearly salary. Now, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] wants to add to that that the clerks shall be paid a wage and a half for time that is over eight hours. That can not be done unless you change the law by which you pay these clerks, because they get so much a year, and no more.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the original provision in the bill be passed without changing the original law?

The VICE PRESIDENT. You can provide salaries for everybody under the sun, but if you do not make an appropriation to pay them they can not get them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, Mr. President, the bill makes the limitation upon the payment of the salaries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. True; but the head of the department—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely modify the limitation to another degree.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The head of a department under the law now has the right to require men to work 7, 8, 9, 10, or 11 hours a day. This bill as it now stands says that this money shall be paid to men who are required to work eight hours, and to none other. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not like to bore the Chair—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator could not do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But, according to the Chair's statement, the head of a department now has a right to call on a clerk to work 8 hours or 10 hours or 16 hours, or whatever number of hours he chooses. The provision in this bill is that—

No part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used to pay salaries or for personal services in any department, bureau, or office in the District of Columbia which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day.

The present law does not require eight hours of labor each day. The Chair must recognize the fact that that provision now in the bill is a change of existing law, because the present law, while it permits the chief of a bureau to make an employee work 16 hours, does not require him to work eight hours. This proposed new law in fact does require him to work eight hours; and to the provision requiring him and compelling him to work eight hours, which is new legislation, I have offered a further modification of the new legislation, to wit, a provision that when he is required to work eight hours he shall be paid time and a half for the overtime. I repeat that at present he can not be required to work eight hours without a special order of the head of the bureau; the law does not require him to work eight hours. If the law right now did require him to work eight hours, this provision would be utterly worthless and purposeless and foolish. To this new provision that he shall be required to work eight hours, I propose an amendment that when he does work over eight hours he shall have time and a half pay for the excess work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He is not required under this bill to work eight hours.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under this provision of the bill he is required to work eight hours, because it says, if the Chair will excuse me—

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; he is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It says:

No part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used to pay salaries or for personal services in any department, bureau, or office in the District of Columbia which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day.

The Chair must recognize, as a matter of common sense, as a matter of purpose, and as a matter of intent, that that provision is intended to make these employees work eight hours, or else not receive any pay.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no doubt about what the law is or what the precedents of the Senate are, or what the rulings are, and there have been a dozen of them strictly in accordance with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to give notice that I shall, when the bill is reported to the Senate, renew my motion to strike out the so-called Borland amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to be permitted to say that it seems to me that the soundness of the Chair's decision can not be drawn in question. I do not mean to discuss its soundness, but apart from the fact that this is new legislation, and obviously so, there are two other grounds on which the point of order could have been founded. One is that to meet the proposed change in the law it would require an increased appropriation, which has not been estimated for, and which has not been reported by any standing committee of the Senate. This is entirely apart from the merits of the proposition to pay wages on behalf of overtime. There is a great deal of merit in that contention as affecting the trades and industries, where the tenure is uncertain and there is no vacation provided by law. There may be some foundation for proposing it in connection with the departments, but the amendment was clearly out of order in this instance.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to take an appeal from the decision of the Chair, and I give notice of that appeal now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 16, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 15, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, F. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, O God, our Heavenly Father, praying for that grace, which makes for an exemplary life, a clean home, and a pure Government, since righteousness exalteth a nation, while sin is a reproach to any people. Hear our petition, O Father, and answer our prayer, in the name of Him who is the world's great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal as read will stand approved.

## RATIFICATION OF PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the governor of Maryland, transmitting joint resolution No. 1, of the House of Delegates and the Senate of Maryland, ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress to the legislatures of the several States, which was read and ordered filed in the archives of the House.

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9867, the urgent deficiency bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9867, with the Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object if we can have the proper understanding. I wish to call attention to the fact that there are some very important Senate amendments on this bill. If the business of the House was not as pressing as it is, I think it would be very well to have this bill go to the committee and have it considered by the committee, but it is tremendously important that the bill be disposed of and enacted into law at the earliest possible moment.

There are many appropriations—many items of urgent necessity—carried in the bill, and it is very important that they should be disposed of. As one Member of the House, I am willing to leave it to the good judgment of the conferees of the House to pass on these very important amendments, providing we may be assured that if any question should arise with regard to the Senate amendments that seem doubtful to the House conferees and on which they can not agree the House may have an opportunity to pass upon the matter before the conference report is finally presented.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say in reply to the gentleman simply this, that touching any amendments of importance there would be no such attempt to forestall the judgment of the House. Unless there was complete accord between all the conferees as to any important amendment, the bill would come back to the House with full information to the House of the situation.

Mr. MONDELL. With that assurance, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill going to conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. SHERLEY, Mr. EAGAN, and Mr. CANNON.

## DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules, I am informed, has reported a resolution making the daylight-saving bill (S. 1854) in order when the rule is adopted. Now, thinking possibly there may be sufficient time left to-day after the disposition of the present bill to consider that measure, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the bill now before the House, the appropriation bill, it shall be in order to take up and consider the daylight-saving bill, but not so as to go over to-morrow and interfere with to-morrow's business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asks unanimous consent that immediately after the conclusion of the discussion and the disposition of this legislative bill he be permitted to take up the daylight-saving bill for the rest of this day. Now, did the Chair get that right?

Mr. SIMS. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does not that practically give the daylight-saving bill a privileged status on this day?

The SPEAKER. It does not. It is privileged for the rest of the day, but not privileged—

Mr. WINGO. That is what I say. It is privileged for this day, after the present bill is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The Chair put the question as the gentleman stated it.

Mr. WINGO. I suggest to the gentleman that he wait until we get to the bridge before we cross it.

Mr. SIMS. It will take no more time to pass the bill than to consider and adopt a rule, and I think this would be a time-saving as well as a daylight-saving request.

Mr. WINGO. It does not appeal to my sense of seriousness to agree even to a rule on that bill. Therefore I object.

MARY M. SAVOY.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia offers a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 250 (H. Rept. No. 383).

*Resolved*, That the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Mary M. Savoy, widow of James Savoy, late an employee on the roll of the House, a sum equal to six months' compensation as a cloakroom man, and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray the funeral expenses of said James Savoy.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I will state that this employee was on the roll for a number of years, and this is the customary and usual resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. WALSH. I want to ask the gentleman reporting the resolution a question. Which cloakroom was that gentleman in?

Mr. PARK. The resolution was introduced by Mr. CANNON. I think he was employed on the other side. He was in the barber shop.

Mr. CANNON. Is this for the widow of James Savoy?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that when I came to Congress, in 1873, James Savoy was a barber and employed over here, and he has been on the roll from that time to this. His situation was in the barber shop on the west side.

I want to say, briefly, he was a colored man, and possibly because he had longer service than I have had I entertain pleasant recollections about him, as I think most of the membership does. He was courteous, square, and honest, and he performed his duties well and has crossed over. I think this is the ordinary resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MRS. ANNIE BAILEY.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I have one other small resolution to submit of the same character.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 259 (H. Rept. No. 387).

*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to Annie Bailey, widow of Pinky Bailey, late an employee on the rolls of the House of Representatives, a sum equivalent to six months' salary, at the rate he was drawing at the time of his death, and an additional sum, not exceeding \$250, to defray funeral expenses.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## POSTAL FACILITIES FOR AMERICAN FORCES IN FRANCE.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 280.

*Resolved*, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to inform the House to what extent there is intelligent and efficient cooperation between the military forces in France and the postal agencies established therein for a prompt delivery of mail matter to the Expeditionary Forces.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.



ENSIGN WALKER WEED.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, on day before yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record. I did that for the purpose of printing an account of the circumstances in which Ensign Walker Weed, of the American Navy, from the town of Glen Ridge, N. J., met his death. I did this because I deemed the circumstances under which he met his death were entitled to public recognition. He was burned in an endeavor to save the life of a comrade who was enmeshed in a flaming aeroplane.

I was asked at that time to withhold my request. Since then I understand this matter has been a subject of consideration by various Members of the House. There have been many acts of conspicuous bravery already performed, and there will doubtless be thousands of others during the continuance of this war. It will be manifestly impossible to print a record of all of them. To print a record of some would occasion discrimination, which would inevitably entail, in some cases, injustice. Therefore it has been intimated that it would be the policy of the House not to print a record of any such occurrences at all, in order to avoid discrimination and injustice. With the understanding that that is to be the policy of the House, I shall not renew my request. [Applause.]

#### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. On the day before yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I made some remarks on the floor of the House relative to the Washington Market Co. in connection with profiteering from the United States Government. In the Washington Star of yesterday afternoon the president of the Washington Market Co. is quoted in such way as questions my veracity. Concerning that I wish to make some remarks.

I stated day before yesterday that the Government was paying \$8,000 a year rental for a portion of the space owned by the United States Government down on Pennsylvania Avenue, and that the United States Government was receiving from that company only \$7,500 a year for all of it. The president of that company is quoted in the article to which I just referred, as follows:

The Washington Market Co. has not rented any of this property to the Government since about the middle of 1915, when the District of Columbia Militia vacated the premises.

The statement which I made, which was to the effect that the Government was now paying \$8,000 a year for only a part of that space, was based upon a statement made to me by Mr. Myer, chief clerk of the Treasury Building. I called up Mr. Myer this morning for the purpose of having him verify the statement which I had made. Over the telephone he told me less than an hour ago that he had gone more fully into the subject and had found that the Treasury Department of the Government is now renting 16,000 square feet of space in the Washington Market Co., and that it is paying not \$8,000 a year, as I said, but \$14,000 a year. He said, however, that the contract of lease was not directly with the Washington Market Co., but that it is with the Mammoth Amusement Co. I asked him who the Mammoth Amusement Co. is, and he said it was A. F. Fox & Co., real estate agents.

The president of the Washington Market Co. is quoted as saying that they have not rented any of that particular property to the United States Government since about the middle of 1915. Bear in mind, please, that the United States Government is getting only \$7,500 a year rent for the land alone, which is valued by the assessor at \$1,200,000. I took up that question with the auditor of the District of Columbia, and this morning he writes me as follows:

WASHINGTON, March 15, 1918.

Hon. BEN JOHNSON,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I have to advise that lease was entered into by the militia authorities, with the Washington Market Co., July 1, 1914, for the rental of armory in the Center Market, at the rate of \$8,000 per annum. These premises were vacated in 1915, for the reason that the Market Co. wanted to raise the rent to \$12,000 per annum.

Very respectfully,

S. ROCHE,

Acting Auditor District of Columbia.

Then the president of the Washington Market Co., if he is quoted correctly, goes into the tax question as to these premises. However, the United States Government has nothing to do with

the tax question. The taxes are not paid to the United States Government but are paid to the District of Columbia, and for every dollar that the District of Columbia collects in taxes from the Washington Market Co. under the half-and-half plan the United States Government duplicates it by adding another dollar.

The president of the Washington Market Co., after speaking of the taxes, is quoted thus:

This makes the total of rental, taxes, etc., on Center Market in excess of \$44,000.

The assessor for the District of Columbia writes me this morning, and in his letter he says that their total taxes are \$19,565.42. But, according to his letter, where the real estate alone is valued at \$1,200,062, the tax on that would be only \$12,006. Then the assessor further says that the Washington Market Co. pay taxes on their fixtures of \$163.88, the full value of the fixtures being \$10,925, and he says they also pay 4 per cent on \$12,383.09, or a tax of \$495.32 on account of gross receipts on a conduit laid under public space. In other words, several years ago Congress granted to the Washington Market Co. the right to lay a conduit under the street for the purpose of furnishing cold air for a cold-storage place across the street, and they pay 4 per cent tax for that privilege, but with that the United States Government has nothing to do.

The assessor in his letter says that the market company pays a total real estate tax of \$22,353.86, but of this amount \$3,447.63 is upon a square in South Washington, far removed from the property on Pennsylvania Avenue.

So that in order to undertake to make their charge appear more reasonable they include the tax paid upon property far removed from the Washington Market Co. I can not but repeat that the Government has nothing whatever to do with the tax that is collected. If the market company owned the property outright, still they would have to pay taxes. The charter granted by Congress requires the company to pay the taxes, and the company took that as a part of the charter.

In the article where the president of this company is quoted as saying that upon the "land alone" upon which the Washington Market stands they pay a tax of \$33,000, that is disputed by the letter of the auditor, which shows that it is only \$12,000.

But I am not so much interested in the tax as I am in the fact that in this indirect way he has undertaken to put me in the attitude of having made a false statement when I stated that the Treasury Department was paying \$8,000 a year for a part of the space for which the market company pays the Government only \$7,500 a year. It turns out to be worse than I was first informed by Mr. Myers. So it seems quite clear now that the United States gets \$7,500 a year for all of the property and, in turn, is paying \$14,000 a year for part of it.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. The Government does not own any of the improvements on the land it rents to the market company?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The Government owns nothing except the land, and that land is valued, as I said, at \$1,200,000, and is getting only \$7,500 a year rental for it.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the value of the improvements?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. About \$900,000; but the Government is getting an upstairs floor space which was used for a while by the District Militia at \$8,000 a year. The rental was raised to \$12,000 a year, and they would not pay it and moved out. Then, I am informed, it was used as a dance hall, I do not know at what price, but it turns up now, rented to the United States Government by the Mammoth Amusement Co., for \$14,000 a year.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it the gentleman's view that the Government is not receiving a sufficient amount of ground rent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am not only of that opinion, but I am absolutely certain that it is not.

Mr. MONDELL. Who is responsible for the fixing of the ground rent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. A former Congress, and I will give the gentleman an insight into it.

Mr. MONDELL. Has the Congress authority to change that ground rent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Let me answer the gentleman's question by telling him in a few moments the history of it. Forty-eight years ago Congress leased the land to the market company for 99 years at \$25,000 a year. During the first year of that lease, by a piece of legislative legerdemain, the rent was reduced to \$7,500 a year. If the lessors of that property were willing to pay \$25,000 a year 48 years ago, everybody knows that \$7,500 a year for it now is too cheap.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How much longer has this lease to run?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It has 52 years yet to run.  
Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman means the original lease was for 99 years?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The original lease was for 99 years and has 52 years yet to run.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The total rent is only \$7,500 a year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And that is owned by this market company?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The property is owned by the United States, but the lease is owned by the market company.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And there is no way for the Government to get more than \$7,500?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; there is. The lease provides that Congress can take back this property any time it chooses to do so by paying for the value of the buildings; and that is exactly what Congress ought to do. It ought to pay for the value of these buildings and take back the property. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which has jurisdiction over these matters. Has the gentleman introduced a bill for the purpose of taking over that property, or to increase the rent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I introduced a bill two or three years ago to take back the property, but I could never get it before the House. I am going to reintroduce the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. What did the gentleman say was the value of these buildings?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The assessor reports the value of the buildings at about \$900,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman from Kentucky think the rent the Government is now paying for space in the Center Market Building is excessive?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly I do.

Mr. MONDELL. Who is responsible for the arrangement whereby the Government is paying this excessive rent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think the market company and its profiteering tenants are responsible for it, because Mr. Myers tells me that he searched the town to find other places where clerks might be put to work, but could not find any except that, and had to take it at that price.

Mr. MONDELL. Then any rent the Government may pay is to be excused on the ground that the Government needs the space? Is that the idea?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; I am not excusing it at all; but I do mean to say that if I had been the authority which was called upon to rent it, I would first have asked Congress to commandeer it for the use of the Government rather than pay that amount. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. COX. How much would be the total floor space which the Government would get if it took possession of it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have not those figures at hand.

Mr. COX. I am just wondering whether or not, if the Government commandeered it and took charge of it, it would not get rid of buying the old Arlington Hotel site at a cost of \$4,250,000, and if that would not furnish enough floor space? Does the gentleman know about what proportion of the floor space in the market the Government pays this rent for?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not. The lease was made on May 20, 1870, to the Washington Market Co., and the lease provided that all of that square bounded on the north by Louisiana Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue, and on the south by the next street behind it. In other words, it takes in a whole square, if I am correctly informed; and not only the whole square but half way out into the street in the rear of the market.

In other words, every time a country fellow comes there with a wagon and backs up and attempts to sell anything from the wagon he has to pay the Washington Market Co. for the privilege.

Mr. HARDY. Does the building cover nearly the whole of the lot?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman know how much rent this amusement company pays the Washington Market Co. for that same space?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have no idea at all, as I never heard of the amusement company until about an hour before I came on the floor of the House to-day. I do not know what they are paying. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] has just suggested that instead of its being named the "Mammoth Amusement Co." it ought to be named the "Mammoth Graft Co."

Mr. LONGWORTH. And do I understand the original lease was for forty thousand dollars and odd?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The original lease was for \$25,000 a year.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And was reduced to \$7,500 a year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Less than a year after the charter was granted there was an item in an appropriation bill which was practically meaningless, and Boss Shephard at that time and some other local authorities of the old city of Washington took the question into the courts, and the courts held that the local legislative body and not the Congress had the right to reduce the rent, and they did reduce it, when they themselves were among the largest stockholders of the Washington Market Co.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. In view of the wonderful business sagacity of the Mammoth Amusement Co. and its great successes, does not the gentleman think it ought to be merged with the Bureau of Efficiency?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have no opinion as to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. He is dying hard. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would like now to read a letter, if the House will indulge me, which I just received from the widow of an ex-Congressman. The letter is dated March 14, 1918, and is written from 1022 Vermont Avenue, this city. It is as follows:

1022 VERMONT AVENUE, CITY, March 14, 1918.

Hon. BEN JOHNSON:

During this great graft of real estate profiteering I have, through force of an unscrupulous landlord, fallen victim, as many others at this present time. I am the widow of the late Jeremiah H. Murphy, of Iowa, who represented that State some few years ago in Congress, and I, through financial reverses, took this house of Col. M. M. Parker, who lives next door to me, as a livelihood in the rooming business. I have been here two years, and all the guests in the house are Government clerks. When the call for clerks to do the Government work was issued, Col. Parker raised my rent from \$75 per month to \$100 per month; in a couple months later he raised it to \$125 per month, and, not satisfied with that, he later demanded \$150 per month, till I got tired of such outrageous treatment. I refused to pay the \$150. He sold this house about 10 days ago to a real estate firm, the business man of the firm, a Leonard Nicholson, 1617 H Street NW., who now demands \$208.50 per month. Is this not outrageous? And, to make matters worse, he has notified me to leave within 30 days, and I have an ill lady here who can not be moved, and these Government clerks—women mostly—have not a place to go. Under these conditions, surely the law can force me out, unless you, through the noble work you are doing, can befriend me in such a dilemma.

I understand the man who has rented this house—a man by the name of Peck; he runs a rooming house at the corner of Vermont Avenue and K Street—intends putting six people in one room—young girls—and men in other rooms, six and seven, charging \$37.50 per month each person; he expects to make money under these insanitary, not saying anything of the moral effect of packing people in such quarters. What is there for me to do, and whom must I appeal to to advise me on this matter? I am,

Very respectfully,

MARY W. MURPHY.

I wish to say, further, that I have in my hand a lease which the wife of a man who is now in France with the Aviation Corps executed with a real estate firm of this city only a few days ago. This morning she went to that real estate firm and was told that they would not accept the lease from her, she having already signed it, because they had sold the property and that the rent had been increased from \$32.50 a month, unfurnished, to \$150 a month, furnished.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. Does not the gentleman believe that a great many of these so-called sales are fictitious?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am satisfied they are.

Mr. RUCKER. In an effort to oppress some helpless tenants; and does not the gentleman believe that as long as the whole world is at war it would be well to introduce a bill to suspend criminal punishments in this town to the extent of giving exemption and immunity to any man who will slaughter one of these profiteers? [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would not go that far, but I do not believe tar and feathers would be out of the way.

Mr. LOBECK. But we have no rails to ride them on now—adays.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I notice by the newspapers that the gentleman has introduced a bill to commandeer on the part of the Government a certain house in this town that has been occupied for some time by Gen. Black.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; I introduced such a resolution.

Mr. KEARNS. But his wife refuses to longer live in the property, and I understand the gentleman has abandoned the idea of prosecuting the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Gen. Chamberlain called me up and told me that Mrs. Black would not continue to occupy



the house under any circumstances, and that she would not live in it if they were to give it to her.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman has given a great deal of thought to matters of this character, and why would it not be well to introduce a bill which would include the families of all soldiers, officers and privates, who are living in rented property in the United States, providing that the rent of that property during the progress of this war shall not be raised?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This matter has many angles to it. I have taken up the consideration of one of them and have been quite busy, as the gentleman knows.

The newspaper interview with Mr. Whitford to which I referred is as follows:

[From the Evening Star, March 14, 1918.]

PRESIDENT OF MARKET COMPANY DENIES CHARGE—SAYS COMPANY DIDN'T PAY \$7,500 RENT AND THEN CHARGE UNITED STATES \$8,000 FOR FLOOR SPACE.

Edward O. Whitford, president of the Washington Market Co., took issue to-day with the statement of Representative Johnson of Kentucky yesterday that his company pays \$7,500 a year rental for property owned by the Government, but demands of the United States \$8,000 for the rent of certain floor space.

"The Washington Market Co. has not rented any of this property to the Government since about the middle of 1915, when the District of Columbia Militia vacated the premises," said Mr. Whitford. "The company is paying an annual rental of \$7,500 ground rent to the District of Columbia, about \$15,000 assessment, and other taxes of more than \$12,000 assessed by the District of Columbia, making the total amount now received annually from the market company for the use and occupancy of the land alone on which the Center Market stands of more than \$33,000. The additional taxes to the above are added taxes paid on the market buildings and improvements, owned by the company, of more than \$11,000. This makes a total amount of rental, taxes, etc., on Center Market in excess of \$44,000."

Mr. Whitford called attention that during the 17 years the District Militia occupied 50 rooms and 3 halls, of 54,000 square feet of floor space, the annual rental was but \$8,000, while the market company furnished heat, light, and did repairing at an estimated cost of about \$4,000 annually.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9314) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. FLOOD, Mr. LINTHICUM, and Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.

#### LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one hour of general debate on the Borland amendment, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and the other half by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment as offered last night and offer the substitute in modified form as it is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Let us hear the modified form read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of section 6 the following:

"No increase herein shall apply to salaries or compensation for personal services in any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the Government or of the District of Columbia, or any bureau or office therein, which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the addition of that to the original amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question under consideration is the original amendment with this addition.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, of course I can not fully discuss this matter in the time allotted to me, inasmuch as it involves so much more than at first appears on the mere statement of the resolution.

But, in a word, the statement has been made that this will cost the Government \$28,000,000. In my judgment, taking those people outside of the city of Washington, by careful computation it will be found it will amount to more than \$30,000,000. In addition to that, the bill which has been reported from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, applying to postal employees, all of whom, outside of the District, will work eight hours, will make an addition of about \$30,000,000, making, in all, \$60,000,000 increase in salary to the employees of the Federal Government under these two amendments.

Now, I would not under any consideration support this amendment for increased salaries at this time unless the employees are required to perform eight hours' service in the District of Columbia. [Applause.] All over the United States, men have been clamoring to get an eight-hour day. They have been granted by the Federal Government, on all Government work, eight hours as a day's labor. Now, in time of war, when you gentlemen must go back to your constituents and ask them to contribute of their means, to economize in their living, you can not in fairness, it seems to me, ask this unless you are willing to say that the clerks in the District of Columbia shall work eight hours a day. I certainly would not ask the people of the United States to contribute of their means unless the Congress and the Government officials shall demand that this money is spent, not for private snaps, but to win the war, and we should be willing to say that these much-sought-for clerks' places must put in eight hours of work a day.

But it goes further than that. There is more involved in this proposition, more than the mere question of dollars and cents. When the people back home shall begin to lag in their interest in winning this war which is overshadowing the whole world, when princes and kings are changed in a day, when the maps of the world may be changed almost in an hour, the most serious moment in the history of the world, in my judgment, in centuries is now before the people, we Members of Congress should be true to those we represent and demand an honest day's work for a day's pay.

We are far removed from the scene of carnage and the scene of action, but if you will carefully study the situation that is presented now to thoughtful minds, we ought to let the people throughout the United States know that right here at the heart of the Government, where all their money is being spent, that it is wisely and justly spent, and especially when the administration is contemplating asking all of the Congressmen to go out and sell liberty bonds, that there is in every heart of those people getting this money that patriotic zeal that prompts every man, from the President down, that is getting this money, taken from the taxpayers, a desire to do his utmost to help to win the war by saving every dollar that he can and making it go as far as possible. [Applause.]

You let the people at home begin to lag in their interest, you let that part of this Government that holds no office, the private citizen, begin to be doubtful, and we have lost the war. Government clerks can not win the war; the men who are offering their lives on the field of battle can not win the war; it will be won by people back home. Our officials and Government clerks should not assume the mental attitude that they will do just as little as possible and will watch the clock and not give more than seven hours of reluctant work to the Government a day. The mental attitude of the Government clerks should be that they will work eight hours a day or nine hours a day, if necessary, and save every dollar they can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, while I am in favor of the present bill as it came from the committee, I am strongly opposed to the adoption of the Borland amendment, so called, which seeks to punish the working girl in Washington for the purpose of making political capital for the benefit of certain politicians.

Twenty years ago Congress enacted the following legislation in the matter of clerical help in the several departments of the Government at Washington:

Hereafter it shall be the duty of the heads of the several executive departments, in the interest of the public service, to require of all clerks and other employees of whatever grade or class in their respective departments not less than seven hours of labor each day, except Sundays and the days declared public holidays by law or Executive

order: *Provided*, That the heads of the departments may, by special order, stating the reason, further extend the hours of any clerks or employees in their departments, respectively, but in the case of any extension it shall be without additional compensation.

Since the enactment of this law the clerks in the several departments have performed their duties in a very efficient and satisfactory manner. No complaints have been made. There have been no strikes among the employees; they have on every occasion rendered extra service without extra pay or additional compensation, and there has been no faultfinding either from the clerks or the heads of the departments.

The present great war emergency has not only called upon the past force of clerks for patriotic and faithful duty but it has expanded and enlarged all the departments, bureaus, and commissions to an alarming extent and has called to the service of the Government a great army of additional clerks and employees, while those who speak for the administration state that before July 1st of this year there will be an additional 20,000 more clerks called to Washington for the war work of the administration.

Greed and avarice have always taken advantage of the necessities and misfortunes of the race. Here in Washington the price of food and rent and every necessity of life has greatly to give them the ordinary and proper necessities of life, and yet the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], shouts himself hoarse by crying economy and that we should save and thus win the war by grinding the poorly paid clerk and requiring of them longer hours and no additional compensation, and in cases where they are not required by their chiefs to remain at their post after the day's work is done fully the eight hours then they shall be punished by receiving no compensation whatever.

It may be well at the present time to consider the actual condition of the Government employees in Washington. Up to the time of the declaration of war a great many men had been employed in the Government service doing clerical work, but the war has called to the service in the field the young men of the departments, while many other male employees have found more lucrative employment elsewhere, and of necessity the clerical help is now being performed almost exclusively by women from all over the Nation who have passed the civil-service examinations.

This is not true, however, as to the heads of the departments, commissions, and bureaus of this city. War has made a radical change in that particular. The clerk has not been promoted except in rare instances and only where he had a political pull, but there has been appointed at the heads of these great bureaus, departments, and commissions a vast army of well-known politicians, largely from the Southland, who know scarcely anything about the duties of their offices and who are now drawing salaries ranging from \$2,000 to \$12,000.

This army of officeholders has taken possession of all the public buildings, desirable business apartments, and well-lighted rooms in this city, and they have swarmed and overflowed into the annexes and extra buildings erected recently by the Government. No one but those who are in the secret conclave and at the council table understand the duties and responsibilities of these new chiefs, commissioners, and managers. The departments have all been enlarged to make a vast and colossal war machine. There has been no abolishment of any old department, bureau, or commission, but new war organizations composed of so-called war cabinets, food and fuel commissioners, Navy shipping boards, aircraft boards, Army departments without end, new bureaus of Government, extra commissions without number have a multitude of subdivisions almost endless. At the head of these many departments, bureaus, and commissions are found these fat fellows drawing big salaries, calling themselves heads of departments, chiefs of bureaus, and managers of commissions. They are distinguished from the clerks under them by having upon their person the uniform of the Army or the Navy. They have never earned any rank or commission on the battle field or on the sea in peace or war. They are, however, wearing the Army and Navy bars and insignia and rank according to the size of their salaries, no doubt. They must be called by those under them generals, majors, captains, and chiefs. Some of them wear spurs, which no doubt were won by valiant service in suppressing the negro vote of the South. They have not been required to pass any civil-service examination, and no examination whatever of a mental nature except proof of loyal and patriotic services rendered for their party in the past and their ability, power, and influence to deliver votes to that party in the future.

We all understand the cry of economy on the part of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], and we also understand the violent denunciation of the clerks by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], who says that we should think

of the people at home who will be dissatisfied with us if we do not work these clerks fully eight hours, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] worked himself up into a frenzy while he shouted:

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY], who opposes this amendment, does not say anything in the interest of the farmers in his county that work from sun to sun, while their poor wives' work is never done. He says nothing about the lumberjacks working for the lumber industries of the country. These very industries are now complaining because Congress is threatening even to make an eight-hour law for their employees, and yet not a word in behalf of these employees is heard.

Yes; it is good politics, no doubt, on the part of those southern Representatives to declaim against the working girls in Washington because she has no vote, but they are as silent as the grave when it comes to appropriate the millions to pay the big salaries of those roller-desk patriots who are serving the Government for the pay in its time of need.

I want further to say to these gentlemen that the constituents of the gentleman from Maine, the farmers and the lumberjacks, are not finding fault with the small pittance you give the working girl in Washington. Many of them have daughters in the employment of the Government here, and they want to know always that their girl from home has the necessities of life from an honest employment and that she has reasonable hours of labor; and while I believe the working girl will find more congenial employment at home, with better pay, I want it understood that they are here at the urgent request of the Government and because the Government has sounded the call far and wide that it was necessary to have the extra clerical help to carry on the work of the war. They are doing honest work with more patriotism than the gentleman from Missouri is now doing in trying to ridicule and oppress them. They are entitled to as much consideration from this Congress as are those who fatten their greed from the Nation's misfortune.

The people at home are very anxious as to how the billions we have raised shall be spent; they are troubled about these "Hog Island contracts," made by the chiefs of these new bureaus and commissions, but they do not worry about the extravagance of the working girl in Washington, for they know she is not liable to become either a slacker or a grafter.

When the working girl in Washington has performed her seven hours of work in a hot, stifling superheated room, shut away from the sunlight and God's fresh air, and with tired hand and aching head longs for the rest of home it will not win this war or satisfy the unrest of labor to say to her she must remain another hour at her post with nothing to do but to watch a weary hour go by that has been lost to her forever.

At the present time, when any emergency comes, when extra work demands her attention, she cheerfully works not only 8 but 10 and 12 hours—far into the night, including Sundays, without any extra pay or additional compensation. This she is willing to do, but she will not be satisfied to have forced upon her an extra hour of useless waiting to satisfy the political ambition of the gentleman from Missouri, who, when this amendment passes, can return to his people in the South and say, "I helped win the war by compelling the working girl in Washington to remain at her department an extra hour after her work was completed without any extra pay or additional compensation."

When this war is ended and our country shall have time to adjust itself to normal conditions, when the people shall know for the first time how their billions have been spent, when investigations of these great bureaus of war shall have been completed, and we shall know the facts, it will then be discovered that it was not the working girl in Washington that was the slacker and the grafter but those who, forgetful of their country and with greed and avarice before their eyes, used the war and its opportunities to fatten their fortunes and fix themselves into permanent and life positions in the bureaus of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes against the proposition to my colleague from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I wish gentlemen who are in favor of the so-called Borland amendment would not deem it necessary to abuse the men and women who have come to the Nation's Capital at the urgent request of their Government to



perform an important public service. Government clerks are human beings, like the rest of us. They are just about as patriotic as most of us, and I think that in this time of crisis the ordinary Government clerk is probably sacrificing as much as the ordinary Member of Congress. The Government clerk is entitled to a square deal in this House. He is representative of every section of this country, and you can not indict the patriotism of the Government clerk unless you are prepared to indict the patriotism of the people of the entire country.

To my mind the problem presented here to-day is a very simple one. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has introduced an amendment fixing a minimum eight-hour day. Now, what is the attitude of the Government clerks toward the proposition? The clerks ask that the Government shall execute the contract which the Government has entered into with every Government employee. I hold here in my hand the Manual of Examinations issued by the Civil Service Commission, and I want to call your attention to one paragraph which has appeared in every manual issued for years:

The law requires of all clerks and other employees of whatever grade or class in the executive departments at Washington not less than seven hours labor each day, except Sunday and days declared public holidays by law or Executive order. These hours, now fixed at from 9 a. m. to 4.30 p. m., counting half an hour for lunch at midday, may be extended by the head of an office if, in his judgment, the public business demands such action. Overtime is without extra compensation.

Then it goes on to give the other details. Now, the Government clerk simply says, "I want the Government to carry out this agreement entered into with me by the Government voluntarily. I am willing to work overtime whenever the head of a bureau or a department may say that the public interest requires such overtime, and I will not ask for any extra compensation. But when the executive officer says that it is not necessary to work more than seven hours, then I think the Government should carry out its agreement with me."

I submit, my friends, that that is a good proposition from the Government's point of view. If you fix an eight-hour day you must of necessity be fair enough with the Government clerk to grant him overtime for such extra hours as he may work.

You will note that the gentleman from Missouri does not couple any such proposition with his amendment. If the gentleman from Missouri came into this House with a proposition asking for an eight-hour day, with compensation for overtime; in other words, placing the Government clerk on exactly the same footing as other Government employees, he would stand in much better position, and, personally, I would be willing to give the proposition very sympathetic consideration. But as a matter of economy the proposition submitted by the clerks means the saving of large sums to the Government.

The other day the gentleman from Missouri succeeded in tacking on this amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill. Did he follow it up with a motion to reduce the appropriation for clerk hire? Not by one penny. And if this amendment that he now offers is adopted, the appropriation for clerk hire will not be reduced one dollar.

So, my friends, the claim that the adoption of the Borland amendment will be followed by a tremendous saving is without foundation in fact, as is evidenced by the gentleman's failure to move a reduction in the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The gentleman from Missouri is a Democrat. The Democratic Party is in control of this Government. When he tells this House and the country that the departments at Washington are filled with slackers, who at a time of crisis would refuse to do a day's work for the Government, should he not realize that he is presenting an indictment against the President of the United States and every executive officer? Because all that is necessary in order to compel the clerks to work as many hours as the business of the Government demands is that the President or the head of any department or bureau should attach his signature to an order directing the extension of hours.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. KEATING. I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is not mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman should not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from Missouri is out of order, of course. But on that point—

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado declines to yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman will endeavor, undoubtedly, to tell you that I am mistaken. I am not mistaken. The gentleman from Missouri should know, because he seems to have devoted a good deal of attention to the subject, what the Civil Service Commission states in its manual, that the hours of labor may be extended whenever the public interests demand.

You have not heard any civil-service employee say that he is unwilling to obey such orders. The position of the civil-service employees in this contest is what I stated before. It is this: "We have entered into a contract with the Government, binding in morals if not in law, by which we were to have a seven-hour day except when the public interest demanded longer hours, and the question of the necessity for longer hours was to be determined by the executive officers of the Government from the President down. We are perfectly willing to carry out that proposition without extra compensation."

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. MEEKER. I think we are all aware that many of these men and women are working overtime. Can the gentleman give us any information as to about the percentage of overtime that is being worked?

Mr. KEATING. I can not give exact figures on that point. A great number of Government clerks are working overtime. But so far as action on this proposition is concerned, they are agreed as to the general policy and are perfectly willing to work overtime when the public interest demands it, not demanding a penny for this extra work, but simply saying that when the executive officers of this Government say that seven hours work is sufficient on a certain day or a certain week or a certain month that they shall have a seven-hour day.

Why, no business man under similar conditions would think for a moment of placing himself in the position of breaking faith with people who had come here at his request. These clerks did not troop to Washington seeking these positions, despite what the gentleman from Missouri may tell you. All over this land advertisements have been placed in the newspapers. Stenographers have been told that they owed a duty to their country to come here to work for the Government, and I know of my own knowledge men who have sacrificed positions paying more than they are getting in the Government service, and who have come here and are now working for the Government for less than they got at home, because they felt that they should have some part in this great contest for democracy.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. No; I can not yield just now. One of these gentlemen entered my office the other day and told me that the first day he was in Washington he worked until 9 o'clock at night. The next day they kept him on duty until 11 o'clock at night. He was not paid a penny for overtime and made no demand for overtime. But the third day they caught up with their work, and the men were let off at the end of seven hours.

Now, my friends, that is the proposition that is before you. It is not a question of dealing with a lot of slackers. It is a plain business proposition, and I hope the House will vote down the Borland amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think the time may soon come when the Government clerks and employees of the United States in governmental departments may call upon some one to save them from their friends. [Applause.] The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] bespeaks admiration for the patriotism of the Government clerks and says that they are as patriotic as the Members of Congress. He says that in the face of the statement made by their other champion, the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN], in debating the amendment yesterday whereby we increased the pay of clerks, and advocating a larger increase than was recommended by the committee, when he said, "If that is the way the Government of the United States is going to treat its employees, you can not expect to have cooperation, you can not expect to have a patriotic feeling among them." I did not know that the employees of the United States Government placed their patriotism upon a basis of dollars and cents. [Applause.] These gentlemen apparently unwittingly are the spokesmen of that small but treacherous element throughout the country who believe there is a union superior to the Union of the States, and that that is labor, represented by I. W. W. and its imitators, because they have not hesitated here in this great crisis to seemingly advocate measures, even when it would appear that they would unquestionably obstruct the country in the proper and successful prosecution of the war. And I say to my friend, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY], who is solicitous for some people who have come here from his district, that we have a higher

interest here in this emergency than that of the few employees who may have come from our districts. [Applause.] That is the interest of the whole country in order that we may win the war. The very law that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] quoted recognizes the fact that in case of emergency these people can be required to work longer than seven hours. Yesterday we debated an amendment which, if enacted into law, will apply to all the Government employees throughout the country alike, giving them an increase of \$120 in their wage or salary up to and including the \$2,000 grade, and I say we should not to-day follow that up by making the clerks here in Washington—the poor, tottering, crippled employees who have to drag themselves up the stairways in the various departments by taking hold of the balusters, as they were so pathetically depicted here the other day—we should not say to them to-day, "We will make of you a privileged class. While the Government employees in other parts of this country must work eight hours a day, you will only have to work seven hours a day."

And if the heads of these departments do not require more than seven hours a day, I submit it is our right to say to them, as representing the people of the United States, that we, the Congress, believe the time has come in this emergency to require more than seven hours a day and to change the law and make it eight hours a day and make it uniform throughout the country in governmental departments.

What a pleasing message to send to the boys who are now giving up their lives on foreign soil, that we here, with many grave measures of importance pending and waiting for action, are spending our time discussing whether the Government clerks in Washington should be required to work only seven hours a day after we have increased their pay, whilst we require Government employees in other fields of service outside of the District of Columbia to work not less than eight hours a day. I would rather send a message across to these boys to the effect that the American Congress will require its clerks to work eight hours a day, if necessary, more efficiently to crush our enemy. Why, the Executive has issued an order, I understand, in connection with the erection of the Treasury Annex Building, abrogating the eight-hour provision of the law in order that three shifts may be used, so that that building may be erected speedily, and I contend that we of the legislative branch of the Government are entitled to say to the heads of these departments, "You should speed up in the departments, and in order to do so you must require at least eight hours' work." [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, section 6 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill as agreed to yesterday afternoon will add an additional appropriation of \$29,000,000 as increased pay to the clerks working in the various departments of the Government. Many of these lower-paid clerks no doubt should have an increase in their salaries, but in my judgment it is utterly indefensible to increase the salary of any clerk who is now drawing \$1,600 a year or more. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] proposes that all Government clerks before they shall participate in this increase in salary shall be required to work eight hours per day. His amendment is just, fair, and reasonable to the clerks and to the taxpayers of the country who will be called upon to pay this additional \$29,000,000, and it should receive the unanimous support of every Member of the House. No Member should cast a dissenting vote against it in these trying and troublesome times that try men's souls. We are engaged in this great war, and every man and woman physically able to work should be willing to do their bit to bring it to a quick and successful conclusion.

It certainly is not an unreasonable request to require the clerks to work eight hours per day. In this connection it might be well to recite a little ancient history. The Sixty-second Congress passed a law fixing eight hours as a day's work for all women in the District of Columbia working in stores, banks, hotels, restaurants, laundries, and so forth. These women actually put in eight hours per day, and I am reliably informed that the average salary of the saleswomen working eight hours per day in the department stores does not exceed \$12.50 per week. If eight hours is a reasonable day's work for women in the District engaged in their line of work, it certainly is not unreasonable to require the clerks to work eight hours per day.

In September, 1916, Congress by law fixed an eight-hour day for upward of 400,000 railroad employees in the United States, and I ask you gentlemen to compare the line of work done by the railroad employees with the line of work done by the Government clerks.

Every time an engineer steps into the cab of his engine and pulls the throttle starting his engine and train onward there is but one-eighth of an inch of iron, the thickness of the flange on the drivers of his engine, between him and eternity. Think of the brakeman on top of a train in that big western country of ours, having from 60 to 75 cars and hauling 2,000 tons to the load, on top of his train, day and night, with the thermometer 20° below zero, on 110 in the shade, with the wind and storm, rain, hail, and snow beating down upon him, so as to make it almost unbearable for a brute, much less a human being. Think of the thousands of switchmen in the various cities coupling and uncoupling cars all night long making up trains to haul food and clothing to the clerks in the city of Washington, while those clerks are in theaters, pool rooms, billiard halls, or ten-pin alleys, or in bed sound asleep, and compare, if you will, the hazardous work done by those employees working eight hours per day, engaged in the most perilous undertakings, with the clerk safely hidden away in rooms built of marble or granite.

Again, think of the 50,000,000 people living in the country on the farms, working from daylight until dark in order to raise food and clothing to feed and clothe these Government clerks. The limitation of the farmer is fixed by the sun. Aye, not even that. Thousands of them have provided themselves with lights hanging on their plows, reapers, mowers, and binders, driving them until midnight. You hear of no strikes, shutdowns, or lockouts or demand for eight-hour day among the farmers of the Nation, and if the clerks in the city of Washington the coming year are to get three square meals per day thousands upon thousands of farmers' wives the coming season will be walking between two plow handles or riding on mowers, binders, reapers, and so forth, in order to raise food and clothing to feed and clothe the clerks, thousands of whom are unwilling to work eight hours per day.

Again, the farmer more or less has to gamble against the laws of nature itself. He must gamble with the season, rain, hail, frost, drought, chinch bugs, Hessian fly, and boll weevil, but with his two strong arms, and his determination to win by eating his breakfast by the lamp, and his supper likewise, he will overcome all these pests and raise an abundance of crops of the sun shines and the rain falls at the proper time.

The clerks in the various departments have 30 days' leave of absence each year, with full pay; 30 days' leave of absence with sick pay in the event they are sick. They have all the national holidays off with pay and in addition have every Saturday afternoon off between the 15th of June and the 15th of September each year. How many days off with full pay do the women working in the department stores and banks, laundries, hotels, restaurants, and so forth, here in the city have? None. How many days off with full pay do the 400,000 railway employees have each year? Not one. How many days off with full pay do the farmers have each year? Not one. In this connection I may say that the Agricultural Department two years ago, after careful investigation, reported that the average income of each farmer and all his family working with him was only \$600 per year, and out of this his living expenses had to come. There is no patriotism in any clerk working for the Government anywhere who is unwilling to work eight hours per day.

I hold in my hand the Washington Post of this day. The headlines are: "Americans killed and wounded on the French front."

This report says 4 soldiers were killed outright, 2 died of wounds, 14 severely wounded, and 40 slightly wounded. No 8 hours per day is going in the trenches of France while our soldiers are going over the top. It may be 24 hours; yes, it may be 48 hours; and every one of our brave boys killed or wounded lost his life or received his wounds in defense of every clerk's job—yes, in defense of the Nation. The death list is small, I know, compared to what it will be six months from now. Yes, it is negligible as compared to what it will be a year from now. Then I am afraid it will mount well into the thousands. [Applause.]

"But," says one clerk, "if I have to work eight hours per day, when will I do my shopping?" Says another husky young man, "If I have to work eight hours per day I will have to get up too early in the morning." I am unwilling to vote this \$29,000,000 increase, or any part of it, to pay the clerks unless the Borland amendment carries compelling every one of them to work eight hours per day. [Applause.]

I will never tell my people that I voted this burden upon them and then refused to vote to compel the clerks to work the insignificant limit of eight hours per day. Patriotism, common decency, and love of country should compel every clerk in all the departments to willingly work eight hours per day without being compelled to do it by law. [Applause.]



Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, as is usually true in a case of every species of hysteria that affects humanity, like the Borland amendment, it proceeds upon a false basis. The author of this amendment takes it for granted that the men and women employed in the various departments of this city are working but seven hours a day and are being paid or overpaid for a seven-hour workday. That premise is false in this, that the clerks in this city are not limited to a seven-hour day and are not paid on such a basis. They have certain tasks to perform, and there is not a department in all the city of Washington where the employment is confined to seven hours. The heads of the departments in the city will tell you upon inquiry that many of the men and women not only work 7 hours each day, but often 8 or 10 hours a day, and without any increase in compensation. They are not paid for overtime, while the employers of labor in private activity are required to pay their help at the rate of time and a half for overtime.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I will.

Mr. HARDY. Is it justice between employees if one department should require nine hours and another department only seven hours of labor?

Mr. KEARNS. It would not be justice if that were true. There is not a department in the whole city of Washington wherein the employees of that department do not put in many hours in the week overtime. If you are working for a private individual, it is true he requires you to work eight hours, but if you work nine he pays you for the overtime, and for the extra hour you get one and one-half more money than for any one of the first eight.

There has been some talk this morning that these men and women who have come to Washington since the declaration of war ought not to come for dollars and cents, that their patriotism is put on a money basis. There has been some talk, too, since the declaration of war, that men employed in private employment have gone on strikes and asked for more money, and that their patriotism has been impugned for that reason. I say to you that since the declaration of war the men who are employing labor are making more money out of that labor of their employees than they have ever made before. Do you impugn the patriotism of these men who are working in such employment when they ask a part of the increase of wealth that their own hands have made? Men on the floor of the House will impugn the patriotism of these men, who only want a certain part of the products of their labor. [Applause.] Their toil has contributed to the increased profits, and justice demands that these toilers receive a part of this profit.

The compensation of Government clerks was fixed back in 1898, when the cost of living was not half what it is to-day. With the exception of one slight increase, it is the same to-day. Labor in private employment has doubled its wage in that time, and has not yet reached its just reward.

I am against this Borland amendment until you increase the salary of these employees to a point that will compensate them for their time and services. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the House by a very small margin voted to include among those employees who would receive the raise of pay the "patronage" employees of the House. I desire now to call to your attention a specific instance of what this means, because little by little, with the help of others, I hope some day to arouse the House to consciousness of the moral issue involved in certain practices that are too general in the House of Representatives to-day.

I shall give a specific instance, and I say that it is not an exceptional instance but is rather illustrative of the system, and I give it that you may think about it. On December 14 the House of Representatives was considering a resolution to appoint clerks for the expenditure committees. Mr. MADDEX, of Illinois, offered the following amendment, which was adopted:

*Resolved*, That no compensation shall be paid under this authority except where a clerk other than the clerk of the Member who happens to be the chairman of the committee is named.

In spite of the action of the House of Representatives in passing that resolution, I call your attention now to the instance of one chairman who, by his seniority attained that dignity in the House, who promptly appointed his own son, who then was and still is his congressional secretary, receiving presumably \$2,000 per year, clerk of the committee of which he was the chairman at \$6 a day. Yesterday you raised his pay and the gentleman who is

the father of that boy voted to raise his son's pay on the theory that he was not getting a living wage at \$6 per day, although on the roll of the House he is presumably getting \$2,000 more. To me these things present moral questions. It is possible that even in this war if the Republicans had controlled this House some such practice might prevail, but, may I say, I hope not. Yesterday, just in time to save and increase the caucus power of the majority of this House, four men, newly elected Democratic Members, came from my State and held up their right hands and swore to be good Congressmen. Almost immediately they cast their first vote for a proposition like this. It was, indeed, a great day for Tammany, and I dare say the four men who came here, though they had never seen their party in caucus in the House, will long remember the opportunity which they had, because they arrived just in the nick of time to be of service to that caucus and to strengthen its grip upon the public purse. [Applause.]

I have many other illustrations that I should like to give, but my time will not permit. You all have them in mind. There is not a man in this House, there is not an employee of this House, who can not cite to you illustrations. In the old piping days of peace, when the revenue of the Government came from an invisible source, these things were not justified; but when your country is fighting for her life, and your boys are at the front offering their lives, when every home in the Nation is giving of its money and its blood to save the very life of the Republic, what do you think of the moral standard of a man or of a set of men who will put such action on the record? [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the law as it now stands is more economical than it would be if the Borland amendment were adopted, especially during this time. The law as it now stands requires the heads of these departments, if necessity requires, to order these employees to work more than 7 hours a day, more than 8 hours a day, more than 9 or more than 10 hours a day. If this amendment be adopted, it will result in a loss at this particular time rather than in a saving, in my opinion, for the reason that there is not a single one of these departments but what of necessity is being compelled to call upon its employees to work more than 8 hours a day, and I shall cite a concrete example. Take the disbursing office of the War-Risk Bureau of the Treasury Department. When they were getting out their pay for the soldiers at the last pay day they requested, and an order was entered, that those working in the disbursing office of that department should keep at work until the work was accomplished, and in order to do that thing they worked two full nights. Compute what that force of more than 800 employees would have been entitled to had we a strict 8-hour-a-day law and the Government were paying them for overtime. No one will contend—and it will be one of the things that will follow as a matter of course—that if a strict 8-hour-a-day law be enacted there will not be a bill introduced for the purpose of providing pay for overtime. So that I say as an economic measure it is far better during this war, when this Government is being taxed to its uttermost in every one of these departments, and when the heads of these departments, if they are true to the trust assigned them, will require of every man working under him that he do his duty and do it well, whether it takes 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 hours—as an economic measure, I say, it is far better to leave the matter as it stands. There is nothing that can be said in favor of the Borland amendment from that point of view. I believe that during this war and until its close the men who are employed in these departments, rather than being referred to as timeservers working for a specific number of hours a day, should be made to realize the fact that their patriotism is being appealed to and relied upon, and that if it takes all of the 24 hours in the day in order to accomplish their tasks these men will freely give of their time to back up the boys on the firing line in France, who will be called upon many times, I fear, to give more than twice 7 hours a day in their performance of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I am not an extremist. I am always in favor of justice and generosity to labor, but I believe that the laboring people themselves, the clerks here, do not object to this amendment. It is a matter of simple economy. One hundred employees in a department at

eight hours a day will do 800 hours of work. If you give them a seven-hour day, it will require 114 employees to do the work. That produces, or tends to produce, a congestion of employees. I believe eight hours is sufficient for the accomplishment of efficient work. That is the time that has been agreed upon by the labor unions all over the country. I believe in an eight-hour day for labor and for clerks, and I can not for the life of me see how anyone can object to this amendment. In fact, I believe that the clerks, but for the influence of the newspapers here in Washington agitating against it, would sign a round robin asking this Congress to fix eight hours as a legitimate day's work. Labor now is scarce all over the country, and a great many persons are coming here to get employment. I do not believe they ought to be brought here with the idea that, while eight hours is a day's work elsewhere, seven hours only is a day's work here. I believe the best clerks and employees of the Government here are willing to work eight hours regularly, and even more if the Government in stress needs it. So believing, I shall vote for the Borland amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN].

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am sorry that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is not here. I do not intend to waste much time on him, because his indictment of me is characteristic of his mental attitude on all progressive questions affecting the interests of labor, either organized or unorganized.

I do not see how the Congress of the United States can do any different in this instance than the President of the United States himself. Just shortly after we entered into the war in 1917 the great State of New York, through its legislature, then in session, put through a measure practically abolishing all labor standards in the State of New York for the period of the war. The President of the United States came out in a positive declaration against the abolition of any labor standard, either by the Government of the United States or the States themselves, and the private employers. The governor of the State of New York saw fit immediately to veto the measure that had passed both houses.

Now, the question that the Congress of the United States is to consider here to-day is a question of contractual relations. Labor organizations and individuals from time to time have been severely criticized for the violation of agreements. Now, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] this morning read to you the Manual of the Civil Service Commission, which has guaranteed to every man or woman that came from your State or my State for the last 20 years that seven hours per day would be the day's work in the District of Columbia, unless determined otherwise by the heads of the departments, and the power is placed in the hands of the heads of the executive departments and independent bureaus to require them to work increased hours without additional compensation, and this is being done now and has always been the practice to require the clerks and other employees to work overtime without overtime compensation; in the mechanical establishments here in the District, where the eight-hour day prevails, overtime pay is allowed for all time worked in excess of eight hours.

Now, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] offers his amendment here to-day, which provides for no additional compensation. You have brought these people here for 20 years or more with the distinct understanding in regard to the hours of labor. You are called upon to consider a proposition that increases their hours at least one per day without any increased compensation, and then you expect them to rest content. I wonder how many private institutions in this country, or corporations, could get the active cooperation of their employees if they were to arbitrarily raise the hours of labor—I do not care whether it is from 7 to 8, 8 to 9, or 9 to 10—without giving those employees some compensation for the additional time exacted.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Is it not true that with the present hours of labor and the present salary over 50 per cent of the persons certified for appointment decline to accept positions in Washington?

Mr. NOLAN. I have no knowledge on the subject, but I presume the statement of the gentleman is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, when I became a Member of this body there were no eight-hour laws on the statute books. For years I made a fight to the best of my ability, assisting the leaders in that movement for an eight-hour day, until the laws which are now on the statute books were enacted. I believe in an eight-hour day for men who labor with their hands. Here is a proposition which until recently, I am compelled to admit, I did not sufficiently consider. When the proposition was first suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] I thought I ought to take a position in favor of the eight-hour day for Government employees. On one occasion, at least, I think I voted for the gentleman's proposition. But I would rather be right at any time than be consistent, and I propose now, for the reasons that I will attempt to give in the brief time I have, to explain why I expect to vote against the Borland amendment.

In the first place, the question of changing the standard of labor, so far as it pertains to the number of hours per day of Government employees, has not been considered by any efficiency board. There is no recommendation of the Borland amendment from any efficiency board. No head of any department has ever recommended this legislation. The only department of this Government which has ever carefully considered this question is the Council of National Defense, and the Council of National Defense, after reciting the various standards set for work the country over, have recommended that there be no change in those standards during the period of this war. No other organization of this Government has given to this question any consideration except the Council of National Defense, and they have declared against it during the period of this war and have declared against the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

As it stands now these hours of labor can be increased by Executive order. Some years ago they were increased half an hour by Executive order. As the law stands now these clerks can be required to work more than seven hours a day by the heads of their departments, and they are required to work more than seven hours a day when more than seven hours of work appears to be necessary. I find them in all of the departments of this Government working more than seven hours a day. I remember when we had under consideration the last revision of the tariff we had detailed to the Ways and Means Committee 15 or 20 of these clerks, who were experts upon this particular question, who were expert accountants, and I saw them go to work in the room of the Ways and Means Committee at 9 o'clock in the morning, and I saw them work all day long and until 12 o'clock at night, and I saw them work all day on Sundays for two weeks of time. This is what Government clerks can do, this is what they are anxious to do, if they are requested to do it and the necessity for it appears. You can not compel a man who works with his hands—

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. I understood you to say that they are perfectly willing to work eight hours a day if they are requested. I am in favor of Congress requesting them to do it.

Mr. RAINEY. You are in favor of compelling them to do it?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. RAINEY. You can not compel the clerk who works with his brain at his desk to work half an hour longer if he does not want to, to save your life. You can not compel a horse to drink if he does not want to drink. You can compel the clerks to loaf half an hour at their desks, those who want to loaf and stay there an extra half hour. That is what you are doing. Those who are efficient and who are anxious to be of service will work more than eight hours when it is necessary, and they do work more than eight hours. Those who are lazy and inefficient will remain longer at their desks if you require them to do so, but they will not work unless they feel like it. I believe in organization of labor if they want to organize. I believe in collective bargaining.

At the present time Government employees are organizing the country over and are becoming affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I regard this as a most dangerous proposition. The Government can not afford to deal with organizations of citizens. There is only one way in which Government employees who are organized can enforce their demands for larger compensation, and that is by threatening Members of Congress in their districts. Sometimes they can frighten some of them, and by doing what they can to elect Members of Congress who will be in favor of their demands on the Treasury, no matter how exorbitant they may be. The number of Government employees is constantly increasing. Organizations of



workingmen enforce their demands by strikes. Of course, a strike among clerical employees of the Government is inconceivable and could not under any circumstances be tolerated.

I am opposed in any way, directly or indirectly, to recognizing organizations of Government employees. All organizations of workingmen agree in their demands for an eight-hour day, and extra pay for overtime, and these demands are being recognized. As soon as you establish an eight-hour day for Government clerks, to that extent you recognize the basic proposition upon which organizations of workingmen operate, to wit, an eight-hour day; and when you do that it will follow as a matter of course that if you require them to work overtime they will demand the usual overtime pay, to wit, one and one-half times as much as their compensation fixed on a basis of an eight-hour day.

Bank clerks are not required to work over seven hours unless it should be necessary in emergencies for them to work longer than seven hours, and then they are expected to do it, and I have seen them, and so have all of you, working late into the night. Government clerks can be required under the present arrangement to work as long as is necessary, and for that reason their minimum workday has been fixed as it is, and at the present time there are thousands of them here in the city of Washington working 10 and even 12 hours per day without complaining, obeying the orders of their chiefs. I see no reason for changing this system of doing things, especially in war time. The Council of National Defense has declared against any change such as this resolution contemplates.

The proponents of this proposition insist that it will accomplish a saving of something like \$7,000,000 per year for the Government. I contend that the change contemplated by this amendment will result in no saving at all to the Government; but, conceding that it does, the proposed increase in the pay of clerks means an additional expenditure of \$28,000,000 per year, and this bill is to be followed by others. It will be difficult for Members of Congress who vote for both these propositions to reconcile their votes. It is hardly a good business policy to expend \$28,000,000 a year and the hundred million or more which will be embraced in subsequent bills, all of which I expect to oppose, for the purpose of saving \$7,000,000 per year. If the Borland amendment prevails and becomes the law, we will at once be confronted with demands for overtime pay, and if the Borland amendment becomes a part of the committee amendment which increases these salaries the parliamentary situation will be that it will be impossible to get a separate vote in the House on either proposition and it will be impossible to defeat either proposition. The increase-in-compensation amendment will go through and the other bills which have in view a like purpose will probably also go through and the result of it all will be an additional charge of \$100,000,000 on the Treasury per year, which charge will in all probability be a fixed charge, and will be continued through the war and perhaps after the war, and we will be confronted immediately with demands for the usual overtime pay, which will result in still further increasing this expenditure by a sum which can not even be estimated at the present time, but which will later amount to many millions of dollars every year.

I expect to vote against this amendment and against the proposition to increase the pay of clerks in the present abnormal period. In my judgment neither of these matters ought to be written into the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to ask if those clerks who were detailed to the Ways and Means Committee were not paid extra out of the contingent fund of the House? I will give you half a minute in which to answer that.

Mr. RAINEY. I do not understand the record shows that, and I do not think it does. One or two of them may have received some extra compensation out of a fund placed at the service of the committee for unusual and very long hours, but I know the clerks regularly attached to the committee received no extra compensation, and they worked far into the night at that time, and at the present time they frequently work 10 and 12 hours a day, and even longer than that, and receive for this service no extra compensation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for one minute.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it was not my intention to say anything on the Borland amendment, and I would not have spoken at this time if I had not listened to the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. It seemed to me, as I listened to that

speech, that it was an indictment of the patriotism of the American workingman.

It is true that there are some slackers among the ranks of the working classes of our country, and we all feel ashamed of them, but not any more so than among any other classes of people in our country; and it ill becomes the gentleman from Massachusetts, and especially one who does not work any harder than he does, to stand up here on this floor and indict the patriotism of the American workingman. [Applause.]

Let the gentleman from Massachusetts go with me into the district in which I live; let him go into the banks there on a Saturday night and see the men in that great industrial iron and steel district marching up to the cashier's window and paying for liberty bonds and savings stamps. I resent the statement he has made. I claim there are just as good and patriotic people among the working classes in this country as there is among any other classes of our people to-day. [Applause.]

I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts did not intend to say what he did. I believe he will agree with me when I say that as a whole the American workingmen have responded nobly during this great crisis and will continue to give their best and all for the great cause which we are contending for to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am for the Borland amendment. I want to say that, in my opinion, the gentleman from Missouri is entitled to great credit and to the gratitude of the whole country for the fight he has been making for the past two years for the principle involved in this amendment. I have not heard one reason nor suggestion in this debate which appeals to me as a fair or justifiable reason why clerks in the departments in Washington should work only seven hours a day when the rest of the men and women in the United States are working eight hours a day and more. [Applause.]

It is not a question of compensation. If they are not getting sufficient pay for an eight-hour day, then an increase of pay should be the problem before us. Let us not seek to shorten the day to fit the pay. These people in Government service here should be required to do a fair day's work, or I might better say they should be permitted to do a fair day's work and should be paid accordingly. Congress has recognized the eight-hour principle time and time again. It is generally recognized as a standard day in private employment throughout the country in nearly all industries. Why a seven-hour day for the clerks in Washington? Their work is no more arduous than that of the millions who toil in the shops and fields and stores and factories and offices everywhere, and these millions have never asked for a shorter day than eight hours.

I insist that eight hours is not too much for any man or woman in reasonable health to work each day. It is not an excessive workday. Men and women are stronger and healthier and better morally, better off financially, better in every way from having worked a reasonable number of hours. There is a point, of course, to which men should not be required nor permitted to go. No one should work to exhaustion, but who will say that eight hours even approaches exhaustion in such labor as these clerks are required to do?

One gentleman said that many had come here from long distances and sacrificed positions with better pay than they are getting here, and that they did it from a sense of patriotism, from a sense of duty to their country in this hour of its trial. That may be true. That is a splendid spirit. I will undertake to say not one man or woman in the departments in Washington to-day who came here with that sentiment in their hearts is complaining of an eight-hour day. [Applause.] Those who came here with that fine spirit of loyalty are willing to work 10 hours a day, or 12 hours a day if necessary under the circumstances, and will not complain about it. [Applause.] It has been urged that some of the clerks work more than eight hours now on busy days. I think that is true. I think I know of a few instances where occasionally clerks have to work 10 hours a day or more. That is one of the wrongs that the Borland amendment will cure. Sometimes Government work can not wait until the next day and clerks in charge of that urgent work have to work overtime. The reason of it is due largely to the fact that a large part of them quit at seven hours. If all of them were required to work the standard day of eight hours all could finish in that time, and rare indeed would be the instances when anyone would be required to work longer than that. Let us be fair to all and permit those to work eight

hours who want to work eight hours and make those work eight hours who do not want to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for one minute.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the justice of this amendment is most clearly indicated in the fact that employees in Washington in the Government Printing Office, in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and in the navy yard, where they work with their hands and toil as laborers toil, and are subject to the injuries which are liable to come upon them by reason of working with machinery, and who necessarily wear out more clothing than those who work as clerks, do work eight hours a day. In the midst of this environment in Washington they are able to get along very well, I hear, working eight hours a day, and I have never understood why men and women working in a sheltered office can not give eight hours to a day's work as well as these laboring people. That is especially true at this time, when the demands of the Government and the demands of the industry everywhere are so urgent and emergent. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has four minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has six minutes remaining.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to answer the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], who said he could not understand why women could not work in these offices as long as men could work.

Mr. BARNHART. I beg to say to the gentleman that I did not say anything of the kind. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then I misunderstood him. I ask the attention of the gentleman to the testimony of an eyewitness, who says:

"I visited the Auditor for the Post Office Department. Let me describe the place. \* \* \* All the witnesses this side of the pearly gates will never remove from my mind the impression I received. I saw scores and scores and scores of young women and middle-aged women and some old women and a few men—nearly all women, though—sitting down at a new-fangled machine, and each of them had before her eyes where she could see it a card with a post-office number upon it, with the figures showing the amount of some postal transaction. It may have been a money order for 10 cents or it may have been one for \$10. She was required to touch exactly the right keys, to punch exactly the right number in a card, and then to punch exactly the right amount in dollars or cents, and if she missed a single figure, if she touched the wrong key once, she was docked, and when she had a certain number of dockage marks against her, her pay was liable to be reduced or she was liable to discharge. So hour after hour they sat there, and there they still sit, like automata, like human machines, their eyes glued upon the paper before them, their fingers working almost, it seems, by magic, touching with great rapidity these keys, then quickly seizing another card and replacing the one just completed. Employees in that department tell me that scarcely a week passes that does not record the fact that some poor girl or woman is stricken with nervous prostration. A body has been broken on the wheel of labor—discarded as worn-out human machinery—mere wastage, no longer to be counted. \* \* \*

"Seven hours and a half a day at that kind of work is about as bad as it was to serve in the galleys of old Rome."

I trust that testimony will satisfy gentlemen that there is a difference between women and girls working at that kind of work and men working in the free, open air.

Mr. BORLAND. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM].

Mr. HELM. Gentlemen, did you ever see a rock thrown into a pond? Do you know where the waves stop? Never until they reach the banks. Now, Washington is the center of a great pond. Throw this seven-hour-day rock into this Washington pond, and every railroad man, every miner, every shipbuilder, every man employed in the public utilities within the confines of the United States will want the same identical favor shown him. This is the one overshadowing, all-important vice of this

proposition. It is this: If the Washington clerks get a seven-hour day the rest of the workingmen and women of the country will want a seven-hour day. And bear in mind that this is the paradise of all the job hunters in the United States. The job hunters who do not get here believe that they have been kept temporarily out of heaven. Do you want to give these Government employees a preferential status? If you do, the rock thrown into this pond will stop at San Francisco and the utmost confines of Maine and of Florida and of Texas. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe I have four minutes remaining. I yield that time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I do not imagine for a moment that it is possible to say anything particularly new at this time, or to give any reason that may be particularly influencing upon the minds of gentlemen present. Ever since this proposition was agitated I have looked upon it as one of serious importance. As we vote upon this we are going to decide whether we are in earnest and whether we are honest on certain convictions we have hitherto pronounced.

From the time I first began work in a legislative body, which was in the legislature of my own State, and during the years that I have been in this House I have on every occasion voted for the eight-hour day. I am going to vote for it now. [Applause.] If I do not, then hitherto I have been acting wrongly and I have not been as generous to the workingmen as I ought to have been, or I have not been honest with myself and with them. Now, I take this position: I have believed in the eight-hour working-day. I believe in it now; and if the eight-hour working-day is sound in principle for working men and working women throughout the United States, it certainly is sound for the Government employees in the city of Washington. [Applause.] Somehow it seems that when a person comes here and gets a job with this Government in Washington he feels favored among men and women and expects to be coddled, to be aided and assisted in a dozen and one ways that the average workingman throughout the country does not expect. I can not for one moment adhere to the sound policy of the eight-hour day, as I view it, and refuse my vote to this eight-hour proposition for the clerks here in the District of Columbia. There are some individuals throughout the country who have felt that they were acting in favor of labor by opposing this. Since this was first started I have listened for some friend of labor to give a reason why we should not require the clerks in the city of Washington to work eight hours instead of seven, and I have never yet found one lift up his voice to give a reason; and I say with all the earnestness I can express that if the labor organizations of the United States are sincere in asking for an eight-hour workday for themselves—and I believe they are—they can not oppose if Congress requires the clerks in Washington to work eight hours also. [Applause.]

These clerks ought to be willing to do that very thing. Some of them—I personally know of many—have been working, gladly working, ever since this war began, not 8 hours, but 10, even 12 hours. I am proud of them. But for the slackers in Government offices who constantly want more pay and shorter hours I have a very different feeling.

During this period now at hand, when we are asking every citizen to sacrifice and to work, requiring many to make the supreme sacrifice, how can we justify any course other than to require eight full hours of these employees? There is a world of work to be done. Every citizen should exert himself to the utmost in the country's service, and no one can say he or she had done a decent day's work for his country if he has worked less than eight hours.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. KEARNS. The salaries of these clerks were fixed back about 1898, and with one slight increase they have never had any addition to their pay since that time. Since that time the wages in private activities have been doubled.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. This is not a contest over wages at all. This has nothing to do with compensation. This has to do with work. I believe in men and women working in the vocations to which they devote themselves. I do not believe in slackers in a shop or in an office any more than I believe in slackers in the Army. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, it is scarcely necessary to go over in detail the arguments in favor of requiring the Government clerks in Washington to work eight hours a day instead of seven.

I desire first to correct a misstatement that has been repeated with dogged persistence during this debate. It is not true that



the heads of the departments can now extend the time to eight hours by a stroke of the pen. The law provides for a seven-hour day and safeguards carefully any extension of that time. The wording of the law is:

*Provided*, That the heads of the departments may, by special order, stating the reason, further extend the hours of any clerk or employee in their department.

The emergency requiring extra work must exist in a particular office or bureau and must affect certain clerks or employees before any such order can be made. No general order could be made extending the hours of all clerks equally for the purpose of promoting efficiency or reducing public expenditures. That can only be done by legislation by Congress, and hence the necessity for this law.

In the second place, I desire to point out that in all the mechanical departments of the Government, which have been on a union-labor scale for many years, eight hours work a day is the rule. This prevails in the arsenals, the navy yards, the Government Printing Office, and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. During the hearings on this salary-increase resolution Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, was on the stand, and he was asked this question:

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to get your view as to what is considered the standard for employees in industrial establishments?

Mr. MORRISON. Eight hours is the standard. There is no question about that.

The seven-hour day for clerks in Washington is hostile to the interests of the toiling masses of the country, because it increases unnecessarily the burdens of government. Every effort which brains could devise and money could command has been used to arouse the organized labor men in my district against me, personally and politically, because I have dared to stand up for the rights of the taxpayers of the Nation against the greedy profiteers of Washington. Every form of misrepresentation has been employed, but I have taken care that the laboring men in my district should know the truth. They are just as intelligent and as patriotic as any other set of citizens when they know the truth. The efforts of the Treasury looters have failed, as shown by the following letter:

OPERATIVE PLASTERERS' AND CEMENT FINISHERS,  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNITED STATES AND CANADA,  
LOCAL UNION No. 17,  
Kansas City, Mo., March 8, 1918.

HON. WILLIAM P. BORLAND.

DEAR SIR: We, the plasterers and members of Local No. 17, of Kansas City, Mo., want to thank you for your promptness in taking up with the War Department the plasterers' end of the work on the hospital units.

Also, we heartily indorse the eight-hour day law for all clerks in Washington (and elsewhere).

Respectfully, yours,

FRANK STUTSMAN,  
Corresponding Secretary.

Gentlemen, these employees of the Government here in Washington were brought here for one purpose only, to do the work of the Nation. This Capital City is not a national poor farm nor an old-folks' home. It is the busy workshop of a Nation—a Nation at war; a Nation which is defending the very life of democracy; a Nation which is toiling early and late—which is paying taxes and buying bonds, which has given its sons to the cause, and stops at no privation or sacrifice to win this war. Must we forget this great Nation of self-sacrificing patriots, must we forget our Army in the field, must we forget the cause for which we fight and listen only to the clamor of self-interest with which we are surrounded here in Washington? God forbid! No man in this House can defend himself before his people for voting for a seven-hour day for the Government clerks. "Choose ye this day which ye will serve."

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I appear in behalf of the Borland amendment, as a better friend of the clerks than the gentlemen who have taken the other side. There is no question about it. And I am a better friend to the clerks than Members of Congress who go round and harangue the clerks associations and their meetings trying to make them believe that Congress is doing wrong by them. [Applause.] I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] because it is in the interest of the good, honest, working clerks. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] shed tears over the overworked clerks who sometimes drop in their places, but not a crocodile tear has been shed here for the overworked farmer's wife whom you and I have seen drop down in exhaustion in her efforts to make a living for her family. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I say deliberately that I am for this because the present system works an imposition on the good clerks. I am not casting any reflections on the heads of departments or of bureaus when I say this. The heads of bureaus and departments want efficiency. They want people who will do good work and bring results, and when they call upon their clerks to work over hours they do not call on slackers who

are constantly watching the clock and complaining about long hours of labor, but they impress into service the good, honest clerk who is willing to perform eight hours of service, and more if it is necessary, for the good of the country. [Applause.]

I am in my office at work till half past 10 to 11 o'clock every night. I deserve no credit for that, but as I walk down the halls of the House Office Building at 11 o'clock at night I hear the click of the typewriter, showing that your clerks are doing their honest work. They know no seven or eight hour law, and are not asking for any.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY], who opposes this amendment, does not say anything in the interest of the farmers in his country that work from sun to sun, while their poor wives' work is never done. He says nothing about the lumber jacks working for the lumber industries of the country. These very industries are now complaining because Congress is threatening even to make an eight-hour law for their employees, and yet not a word in behalf of these employees is heard.

I am an organization man. I joined the Ku-Klux Klan and nearly everything else that would let me in, ever since I was a boy. I have been off and in the Methodist Church, always believing and practicing the doctrine of falling from grace. [Laughter.] I believe in the clerks' organization, and I am ready always to help the really good clerks. Many of them have come to me and stated, "Mr. BURNETT, we think we ought to have better wages, but we are not asking for a seven-hour law, and we are not opposed to an eight-hour law." The only one from my State that has come to me with a protest against the eight-hour proposition is a man that has been here for 20 years. He is a white man at that, and is still only getting \$1,000 a year, and perhaps does not earn more. He is not from my district. That is the kind of clerks that are making the complaints. The man or woman that is willing to do his patriotic duty and help win this war is not the one that is besieging Congress against the Borland amendment. I have shown my friendship for the clerks and my interest in them, unlike some gentlemen who vote against the increase of their salaries, but by voting for every increase, especially in these days of the increased cost of living. All of them that work are worthy of their hire. But, gentlemen, I am not in favor of men or women boasting of their patriotism and refusing in the days of the war to perform eight hours service, when the railroad men and others in the industries of the country are performing eight hours arduous labor every day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment which I send to the desk read.

The CHAIRMAN. There should first be a preliminary vote taken on the amendment offered to the committee amendment. The Borland amendment is offered as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. No; Mr. Chairman, the "Borland amendment" is offered as an amendment to the committee amendment. No amendment to the Borland amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is the situation, it is true.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have my amendment read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent to have his amendment read for information.

Mr. BORLAND. I object.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Is the gentleman afraid of free speech? Does the gentleman object to my stating what it is?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order. The Chair must put the unanimous-consent request. The gentleman from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that the amendment sent to the desk may be read for the information of the committee.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have been obliged to refuse so many requests for time that I am constrained to object.

Mr. HAMLIN rose.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, an amendment to an amendment exhausts the number as far as amendments are concerned, but a substitute is in order.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer mine as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] rise?

Mr. HAMLIN. I rose to make the same suggestion that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] made, that a substitute would be in order.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, may my amendment be entertained as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is in order as a substitute.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. We will have the pleasure of hearing it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "day," in the Borland amendment, add: "Provided, however, That all time over eight hours by those rendering personal services in said departments shall be paid for on the basis of time and one-half."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, that is not a substitute, it is a subterfuge. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment for the same purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York desires to offer a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

No increase herein shall apply to salaries or compensations for personal services in any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or any bureau or office therein, which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial act approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day, allowing for all time over eight hours a compensation at the rate of time and one-half for overtime.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Is that a substitute offered for the committee amendment or for the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand.

Mr. LUNN. It is offered as a substitute for the Borland amendment, which is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman's substitute clearly appears to be the Borland amendment with a few words added at the end. That is not a substitute. It is a method of making an amendment in the third degree. The substitute, of course, must, in like manner, take the place of the whole proposition before the House. What the gentleman's amendment really does is to add three or four words at the end of the Borland amendment in the form of amendment and then offering it in the form of a substitute.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is another thing, Mr. Chairman; it is open to the further objection because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri was purely a limitation. The substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] is more than a limitation in that it proposes legislation and in itself would increase the expenses of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this further suggestion, that the Borland amendment is limited to one subject, namely, the extension of the hours of employment of those who are receiving the increased compensation provided in the so-called committee provision. The amendment in the way of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] relates to a different subject matter. It relates to compensation and increased pay. The Borland amendment is exclusively limited to hours of employment and not to the rate of pay. Therefore it comes within the general rule that it is not germane to a proposition limited to one subject to amend it by a different subject matter. The Borland amendment merely provides for an increase in the hours of labor and this amendment provides for an increase in the compensation. For that reason I maintain it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The first objection urged to the matter proposed as a substitute, is that it is not a substitute. But why is it not a substitute? A substitute is an alternative proposition. If something is added to a pending amendment, thereby creating a new proposition, and the total thus created, is offered in lieu of the pending amendment, then a legitimate alternative proposition is certainly submitted for the one under consideration. That is what is proposed to be done by the matter submitted. This matter is another and different proposition to the one pending, and strictly and technically is a substitute. The first objection is therefore overruled.

The next objection is that the substitute proposes new legislation. This point seems to the Chair to be well taken. The substitute does propose legislation, and the point of order, on that ground, is sustained.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No increase herein shall apply to salaries or compensations for personal services in any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or any bureau or office therein, which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day: *Provided*, That during the continuance of the war all or any portion of the clerical forces required in said departments may be selected and employed without regard to the provisions of civil-service law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I make the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman reserve it for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. For how long?

Mr. RUCKER. For five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. In view of the fact that the gentleman kept us here so long the other day, until after the dinner hour, and out of generosity to him, I shall not make the point of order but will reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the point of order for what length of time?

Mr. STAFFORD. For five minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that some gentlemen in the House are improving all of the time. [Laughter.] The substitute offered by me ought not to be cast out on a point of order. It is in the interests of the clerks in Washington who, we are told, work so hard. When this Congress wrote into the law some years ago a provision that in the departments in Washington no clerks should work less than seven hours a day, that provision was immediately construed to mean that no clerk should work more than seven hours a day. Seven hours became the limit. Then we have a provision in civil-service law which is humane, and which provides that civil-service clerks in the Government employ shall have 30 days' sick leave, with pay, each year. That provision in the civil-service law which provides for annual sick leave for 30 days, with pay, has resulted and is resulting almost disastrously. It is actually destroying the health of the people, because they construe that to mean that each man and each woman must be sick two and a half days every month, and they get sick regularly and stay sick the full two and a half days.

Mr. BORLAND rose.

Mr. RUCKER. If my friend is very much disturbed and he has some suggestion to offer or question to ask, I yield to him.

Mr. BORLAND. I was going to suggest to the gentleman that we have an immediate vote, because a point of order is going to be made against the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RUCKER. I know it is. The gentleman has not given me any information at all. I want to say that I am not going to vote for the Borland amendment because it is offered by my colleague, and neither would I vote against it because elsewhere some great and distinguished citizen of the United States declared against it yesterday. I am going to cast a vote which reflects my judgment, and if the Borland amendment is adopted, then I am going to cast a vote which will help to cause rejoicing if not applause in the gallery, namely, for the amendment increasing clerical salaries. If the Borland amendment be defeated, then I hope every man will regard it his conscientious duty to his constituents to vote down the proposed increase in salary carried in the committee amendment, because these clerks ought not to have an increase of pay unless they are required to perform a reasonable amount of service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the Rucker amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order. This amendment, of course, is infected with the same vice as the Lunn amendment was. It takes the Borland amendment and couples with it legislation, and is then offered as an alternative proposition. For the reasons already stated, the Chair is thoroughly of the opinion that this so-called substitute is not in order, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment. After the words "*Provided, however*," in the Borland amendment, insert the words "and during the continuance of the present war."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers as a substitute what is really an amendment to the amendment, in itself an amendment to another amendment. The proposed amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is an amendment in the third degree and is out of order.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. May I offer the Borland amendment with those words added at the end of it? Will that then be a substitute?



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can offer a substitute.

Mr. LONDON. I do, then, offer the following substitute:

After the Borland amendment add the words "and during the continuance of this war."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is an amendment in the third degree. I maintain it is not a substitute, but is an amendment in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled on that—that if you take an amendment and add to it, and thereby make a new proposition, and offer it as an alternative proposition, it is a substitute.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the further point that this legislation is being enacted for a single year, and if the war should last for five years this substitute would cover that, and it would be out of order on that ground.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Would not that amendment be out of order on the ground that it goes beyond a year's time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is just considering the point in connection with the amendment. The Chair is ready to rule. The life of this appropriation bill is fixed. The matter proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] may carry it beyond the life of the appropriation bill.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I offer, then, the following as a substitute:

Add, at the end of the Borland amendment, the words:

"Provided, The war continues until June 30, 1919."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the gentleman desires to offer another substitute?

Mr. LONDON. I offer to add the following words at the end of the Borland amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must offer it as a substitute.

Mr. LONDON. I offer it as a substitute. Will the Chair permit me one moment? I have so many parliamentary advisers misleading me that I am all confused. [Laughter.] I am offering the following as a substitute to the Borland amendment:

Add at the end of the Borland amendment the following words:

"And provided, The present war is ended prior to June 30, 1919."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that has nothing to do with the subject matter before the committee. It does not make any sense.

Mr. LONDON. I have not the Borland amendment before me, and I do not know how much sense there is in the amendment. I am on an original base. I am trying to make something that is nonsensical sensible, and I have a great deal of difficulty, I admit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of section 6 the following:

"No increase herein shall apply to salaries or compensations for personal services in any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or any bureau or office therein, which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day: *Provided*, The present war is ended prior to June 30, 1919."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the gentleman has finally gotten his substitute in order. The Chair will submit it anyhow. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, may I speak on that under the rule?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is not germane.

Mr. LONDON. Under the agreement I have a right to speak for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the debate was closed on this amendment by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Not on the amendment to the amendment. There was an hour for general debate on the other amendment, and an hour's debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. That did not say that when that was concluded, if a matter came up subject to amendment and an amendment was offered, there would be no debate on the amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. It was provided that the other proposition involved in the eight-hour proposition should be submitted within the hour, and the reason for that was that we had disposed of all the amendments to the committee amendment prior to taking up the Borland amendment, and it was the complete

sense of that agreement that one hour should conclude the debate upon the eight-hour proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say this, if the gentleman from Missouri will give him his attention: If the unanimous-consent agreement provided that the vote could be taken at the expiration of the hour on the Borland amendment and all amendments thereto in the nature of a substitute, then, of course, this debate is out of order. Is there any such limitation? I do not think it is in the consent agreement.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know whether the Chair has ruled on the point of order or not, but I submit, if the Chair will examine this amendment he will hold it is not in order. I will make the point of order it is not germane and that, at the same time, it has not any sense.

The CHAIRMAN. As to whether it makes sense or not is not a parliamentary question. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the Chair will pardon me, this amendment is simply the Borland amendment, with these words added:

*Provided*, That the present war is ended prior to June 30, 1919.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the expiration of this bill, is it not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the expiration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The point is, however, Mr. Chairman, that here is a proposition made under the Borland amendment, which will put the eight hours a day in operation immediately after July 1. And here is a proposition submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] that it shall not go into operation provided the present war is ended prior to June 30, 1919, after the bill has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. LUNN: "No part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used to pay salaries or for personal services in any executive department, bureau, or office of the United States which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day: *Provided*, That the foregoing limitation shall not apply to employees in any bureau or establishment where such employees are not paid time and one-half for overtime."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. It provides for the method of payment of the employees of the United States. It is really legislation and not germane to the amendment. It is not a limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, the Borland amendment is a limitation on the application of wage and salary increases. It provides that the increases shall not be received in any department or bureau of the Government where the employees work less than eight hours.

The substitute which I have offered is an additional limitation, the further limitation being that not only shall these increases fail to apply in those departments where employees do not work for eight hours, but these increases shall not apply in any department where there is not a provision for time and a half for all overtime above eight hours. I am arguing for the legitimacy of the substitute at this time. I feel that the point of order against it is not well taken. [Cries of "Rule!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to have this matter discussed.

Mr. KEATING rose.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I rise to make the point of order that the substitute in the form it is is suicidal and defeats itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] was proceeding to discuss the point of order. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Indiana as soon as the gentleman from Colorado is through.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is the slightest question that this amendment is in order at this time as a substitute. The Borland amendment undertakes to limit the payment of these increases of salary to employees of bureaus where the eight-hour day is enforced. The Lunn substitute provides that the limitation in the Borland amendment shall not apply in any bureau where employees are not paid for overtime. That is all there is to the substitute.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman submit to a question?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is there any provision now anywhere for paying them for overtime?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENSON. Then is not that an addition to existing law when you undertake to provide for paying them overtime?

Mr. KEATING. Not at all.

Mr. Chairman, the Lunn substitute does not change existing law. The Borland amendment provides that the increases in salary shall not be paid to employees in any bureau unless the eight-hour day is enforced. The substitute provides that the Borland amendment shall not affect the employees in any bureau where workers are not paid for overtime.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. As I understand the substitute, it makes this change: The Borland amendment requires eight hours in all departments. The substitute requires eight hours only in those departments that provide for overtime?

Mr. KEATING. Yes. I accept the gentleman's suggestion, because it states in a few words exactly what the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] is endeavoring to do, namely, to provide that the limitations of the Borland amendment shall not apply to any bureau where those who work more than eight hours are not compensated for overtime. [Cries of "Rule"!] ]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, either this amendment changes existing law and seeks to do by indirection what it can not do by direction, or else it has no effect under the existing law of the United States. It says that this amendment for eight hours shall not apply, except to departments that pay time and a half for overtime.

Now, let us see what operation it would have under that kind of a provision. In the hearings on this amendment Mr. Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, was asked how many departments of the Government were on an eight-hour basis, and he answered: "All people who work in the navy yard, all the people in the Government Printing Office, most of the people in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing are on the eight-hour day."

Those are the people who are to-day on the eight-hour basis. Those are the people who are to-day paid time and a half for overtime. This amendment would apply then only to Government navy yards, arsenals, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the Government Printing Office. In other words, this amendment would not apply to any department that is not now maintaining an eight-hour day, so that either the gentleman's amendment is meaningless and can not apply to a single department that is now maintaining an eight-hour day, or else he is seeking to do by indirection what can not be done directly. The chairman is urged to take judicial notice of the fact that the existing statutes of the United States require an eight-hour day in these mechanical departments.

The purpose of the amendment I have offered and its whole spirit clearly is to require an eight-hour day in the departments that are not now maintaining it, and yet the gentleman's amendment would entirely change the whole purpose of the amendment by requiring it not in the departments that are maintaining a seven-hour day but in all the departments that are maintaining an eight-hour day. If that is not a radical change in the amendment it would be difficult to conceive of one. The gentleman is bringing in an amendment here that I say is either absolutely meaningless under the existing statute law or if it has any meaning and force it goes into legislation and applies to departments that do not now pay on the basis of eight hours.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the Borland amendment is itself an amendment to a section of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill—legislation made in order by a rule adopted by the House. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] is attempting to amend the Borland amendment by offering a substitute. Ordinarily legislation, unless it is a limitation under the Holman rule, is not in order on an appropriation bill. This House adopted a rule making section 6 in order. It is purely legislative, raising the salaries of employees. The Borland amendment is offered as an amendment to this legislation. The substitute of the gentleman from New York is offered as a substitute for the Borland amendment. All of section 6 is legislation made in order by a rule adopted by this House, and I do not think that the point of order is well taken and can lie in this instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked for a discussion of the point of order, because he was somewhat in doubt as to the ruling proper to be made. The substitute of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN], is offered to the Borland amendment, and it is insisted that it is in order as a limitation. This matter of limitation under the rules of the House, is frequently misapprehended, and amendments offered as limitations, are not limitations at all, under our precedents. This substitute is presented as a limitation on a limitation, and therefore presumed to be in order. But the Borland amendment is really

not a limitation on an appropriation bill. It is in substance, legislation on an appropriation bill, and would be out of order, but for the Holman rule. It is cast in the form of a limitation, but in essence it requires the executive departments to which it relates to maintain an eight-hour system. But since the effect of the Borland amendment is to secure a larger return of work to the Government for the amount of money that would otherwise be paid for a less return of work, it effects a retrenchment of Government expenditures, and is therefore in order. The Borland amendment is something more than a negative prohibition on the use of moneys. In this connection, in order that the nature of a limitation may be more perfectly apprehended, it will be well to cite some of the precedents.

Legislation may not be proposed in the form of a limitation. (4 Hinds, sec. 3931.)

The House by limitation on a general appropriation bill may provide that no part of an appropriation shall be used for a certain purpose. (4 Hinds, 3917.)

This is upon the theory that the House may deny an appropriation for a purpose authorized by law. It is not in order to legislate as to the qualifications of the recipients of an appropriation, but the House can specify that no part of an appropriation shall go to recipients lacking certain qualifications. (4 Hinds, sec. 3942.)

A limitation is negative in its nature. (4 Hinds, sec. 3955; id., sec. 3967.)

The limitation must be upon the appropriation and not an affirmative limitation of official functions. (4 Hinds, sec. 3957.)

A limitation must not include positive enactments establishing rules for executive officers. (4 Hinds, sec. 3967.)

The limitation permitted on a general appropriation bill must in effect be a negative prohibition on the use of money, not an affirmative direction to an executive officer. (4 Hinds, sec. 3974.)

Now the Borland amendment provides that the salaries afforded by the committee amendment shall not be paid to the clerks in any executive department, bureau, or office of the United States which does not require eight hours of labor a day. It does not relate to recipients lacking certain qualifications, but to hours of work required by departments, bureaus, and offices of the United States. Even if the department or bureau has authority under law to work its employees less than eight hours a day, this amendment in substance says to such a department, you must work your employees for as much as eight hours a day in order to enjoy the benefit of the appropriation designed for the payment of employees. The objection that this amendment, is in effect legislation, is cured as noted above by the fact that the increased return in work secured by requiring the employees to work for eight hours a day, instead of seven and a half as formerly, but at the same compensation, will operate a reduction of expenditures, thereby bringing the amendment within the saving effect of the Holman rule. But what will be the effect of the substitute?

The substitute in substance provides that the Borland amendment shall not apply to any department, bureau or office, where the clerks are working for eight hours, or less than eight hours, with no provision for pay for overtime work. Hence in all such departments, bureaus and offices, the clerks will receive the compensation provided by the committee amendment. The substitute further provides that in those departments, bureaus and offices, where the clerks work eight hours, and are paid time and a half for overtime, the Borland amendment shall apply, that is that the employees in such bureaus, departments, and offices, shall also receive the compensation provided by the committee amendment. In this view of the effect of the substitute which is to replace the Borland amendment, how can it be argued that the substitute which is legislation, will reduce expenditures? If it will not operate ex proprio vigore, to reduce expenditures, then it is not in order. The substitute must be considered with reference to its operation, meaning, and effect, as a whole. In the opinion of the Chair, the substitute is legislation. It is not shown that it will effect a retrenchment. Hence it is not within the Holman rule. Further the Chair does not think that the substitute can be regarded as a pure limitation. For the reasons given the point of order to the substitute is sustained.

The question now is on agreeing to the Borland amendment.

The question was taken, and the chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KEATING and Mr. LUNN demanded a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 121, noes 82.

Mr. KEATING. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed Mr. KEATING and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.



The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 128, noes 88.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to the final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House with the following amendment:

Strike out lines 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, on page 64.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOOD. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Does any other gentleman who is opposed to the bill want to move to recommit it?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I move to recommit.

Mr. LUNN. I move to recommit the bill with instructions to strike out the Borland amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LUNN. I am.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it possible that anybody is opposed to a bill appropriating money to pay the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not answer such a question as that.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I move to recommit the bill with the following amendment—

The SPEAKER. There is already one motion to recommit.

Mr. BORLAND. I rise to make a point of order against the motion to recommit of the gentleman from New York on two grounds.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. The point of order is on two grounds. First, that the House has just adopted the amendment, and therefore it is not a proper motion to move to recommit, and, second, that the Borland amendment was an amendment to an amendment and is not subject to be stricken out in that way.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is it in order to make more than one motion to recommit?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; when the first motion went out on a point of order.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is it in order for more than one motion to recommit to be submitted to the House?

The SPEAKER. Why, yes; you can submit such motions until you get one that is in order.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I have one to offer.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I have one I would like to send to the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman against the bill?

Mr. KINCHELOE. No, sir; I am not against it.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Rhode Island against it?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I am partly against it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I insist that as no gentleman has announced his opposition to the bill, recognition goes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The SPEAKER. Of course, that is correct. The Chair laid down the rule that he was going to pursue in this House about motions to recommit three years ago, and he is going to stick to it until he is overruled. Under the circumstances presented

here the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] is entitled to recognition, and the Clerk will report his motion to recommit, and we will see if that is in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Good moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith, with an amendment striking out, on page 64, lines 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, which reads as follows:

"Baltimore, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, \$2,500; paying teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$1,900; exchange teller, \$1,800; vault clerk, \$1,800; clerks—2 at \$1,600 each, 3 at \$1,400 each, 3 at \$1,200 each, 3 at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$840; 3 watchmen, at \$720 each; in all, \$31,500."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just recognized the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KINCHELOE. To amend his motion.

Mr. GOOD. I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question.

The question being taken, the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit with instructions offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman state what his proposition is and what it means.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Subtreasury business.

Mr. DYER. What part of it?

Mr. GOOD. To eliminate Baltimore.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. McARTHUR. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is trying to get it. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understood the Chair to state that this amendment was as to the entire Subtreasury business. Does it not pertain to one office only of the nine?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read it again.

The motion to recommit was again read.

The SPEAKER. This applies only to Baltimore.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 70, noes 119.

Accordingly the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. This motion to recommit having been defeated, is it in order to offer one that has merit and that will be adopted?

The SPEAKER. No; only one motion to recommit can be made.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question being taken, the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### DAYLIGHT-SAVING BILL.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I present the following report (H. Rept. No. 386) from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 267.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration of S. 1654, entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," under the general rules of the House.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this proposes for the consideration of the House the bill to advance the standard time one hour during certain periods of the year. It is said that 12 countries in Europe have already adopted this principle. It will work to the advantage of the laboring people of the country in advancing the clock one hour, and give them that much more time to spend with their families at home in the afternoon.

I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is said that the American people are conservative. That is stating it mildly. We are the last among the great nations to take advantage of the opportunities that Ben Franklin said over 150 years ago the world would have of saving candlelight and fuel by changing the clock.

This bill is tardy in coming before the House. When the matter was submitted to the Committee on Rules the conservatism that is usual in that committee was laid aside, and

the committee reported the rule providing for the consideration of this bill.

I said a moment ago that we were a conservative people. Most people in the country, without regard to where they live or what their business is, have been in favor for years of changing the date of the inauguration of the President of the United States from the 4th of March until some day in the spring or early in the summer, when it would not endanger the lives of those who come here to attend the inauguration. But because Washington was inaugurated once on the 4th day of March they can not change the date. The first time Washington was inaugurated was on the 30th day of April, and if we could change the date from the 4th of March to the 30th day of April we would show just as much reverence for the memory of the first inauguration of President Washington as by showing a veneration for his second inauguration on the 4th of March. But we are so conservative that when we get into a way of doing things we refuse to change. Monarchies, kingdoms, and empires change their methods and their feast days. If the king's birthday comes when it is cold and dreary, they change the date to the most pleasant and happy day of the year in order that they may celebrate it without danger to health and life. Other countries have sought to save daylight, to use what daylight they require, by moving the clock forward, and have some left for recreation for their people who work; in order that places of employment and business may close and employees have time for rest and recreation in the afternoon during the summer season. Other countries have done that. We have failed. The time has now come when I believe the House of Representatives will lay aside this species of standpointism and join with those who are in favor of advancing the clock one hour, rising an hour earlier between the 1st of April and the 1st of October, and retiring, if they choose, an hour earlier at night. I am in favor of the rule and of the bill which it makes in order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. The rule in terms provides that the bill shall be considered according to the House rules. That would permit of one hour of debate, in case the gentleman from Tennessee wished to move the previous question. Now, there are a number on this side of the House who would like to discuss this bill, and I would like to inquire what is the purpose of the gentleman from Tennessee if the rule shall be adopted as to closing debate?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to answer.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, this is the only opportunity we will have to consider this bill at all. My purpose was, after the one hour was exhausted, to which I would be entitled, to move the previous question on the bill and all amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not the gentleman ask unanimous consent to extend the time beyond the hour for a reasonable time, so that it would permit Members to have some discussion on the bill? I want to say to the gentleman that there are a number on this side who have asked, in the aggregate, for more than one hour's time. Would not the gentleman ask to extend the time to some reasonable hour this afternoon before he moves the previous question, so that the bill could be passed this evening?

Mr. SIMS. Let me say to the gentleman that after the rule is adopted and the one hour is used we will see how the matter develops. I would not be opposed to giving a reasonable time if I did not lose the parliamentary opportunity of moving the previous question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that would be satisfactory.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, might I suggest that this arrangement can not be made before the rule is adopted?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] five minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to vote in the Rules Committee for the favorable report on the resolution making this daylight-saving measure in order. I am glad now to urge the adoption of the rule and the passage of the measure itself.

This idea is not a freak proposal; it is founded in common sense. It is not a new, untried experiment. It is in successful operation in 12 European countries and time has vindicated every argument advanced by its proponents.

The idea of saving an hour of daylight each day during the summer months is said to have originated with William Willett, a London architect, some 10 years ago. As he walked through the streets of London in the early morning hours, he noticed how deserted they were, even when fully lighted by the sun.

Observing this, he conceived the idea of moving the clock ahead an hour in summer, so that the people might have an hour more of daylight.

Ridicule was heaped upon the proposal. Innumerable objections were proposed. In the British Parliament the legislation embodying the idea was defeated in 1909, 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1914. But more numerous became those who saw advantages in it, and on May 17, 1916, the measure was passed in Parliament. Since then France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Portugal, Australia, and Iceland have followed.

The committee appointed to investigate results in England reported that—

we can say unhesitatingly that the vast preponderance of opinion throughout Great Britain is in favor of it not only as a war measure but as a permanent institution.

Simply and concisely this measure provides that on the last Sunday of this month at 2 o'clock a. m. the clocks shall be advanced one hour. On the last Sunday in October at 2 a. m. the clocks shall be turned back one hour, putting them just where they were before.

It will create no confusion, but it will give an extra hour of daylight, with all the manifold advantages which that involves. It will result in saving of fuel, in added time for the production of food, in increase in outdoor exercise and recreation, and in general improvement of health.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor adopted resolutions in favor of this measure, stating—

that we urge the inauguration of the daylight-saving project for the conservation of time and opportunity for greater leisure and open-air exercise for the masses of the people.

The Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce and a host of business organizations have indorsed this measure and urged its passage.

Let the cavillers ridicule the idea of saving daylight; let the would-be humorists laugh at it as they will. The fact is that the practical results of the measure will be more than 150 hours of daylight leisure for every man and woman and little child. That one tremendous boon justifies the passage of this bill, and I sincerely hope that the House of Representatives will do what the Senate has already done and enact this measure without more delay.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1854) to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purpose of establishing the standard time of the United States, the territory of continental United States shall be divided into five zones in the manner hereinafter provided. The standard time of the first zone shall be based on the mean astronomical time of the seventy-fifth degree of longitude west from Greenwich; that of the second zone on the ninetieth degree; that of the third zone on the one hundred and fifth degree; that of the fourth zone on the one hundred and twentieth degree; and that of the fifth zone, which shall include only Alaska, on the one hundred and fiftieth degree. That the limits of each zone shall be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers engaged in commerce between the several States and with foreign nations, and such order may be modified from time to time.

Sec. 2. That within the respective zones created under the authority hereof the standard time of the zone shall govern the movement of all common carriers engaged in commerce between the several States or between a State and any of the Territories of the United States, or between a State or the Territory of Alaska and any of the insular possessions of the United States or any foreign country. In all statutes, orders, rules, and regulations relating to the time of performance of any act by any officer or department of the United States, whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government, or relating to the time within which any rights shall accrue or determine, or within which any act shall or shall not be performed by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, it shall be understood and intended that the time shall be the United States standard time of the zone within which the act is to be performed.

Sec. 3. That at 2 o'clock antemeridian of the last Sunday in April of each year the standard time of each zone shall be advanced one hour, and at 2 o'clock antemeridian of the last Sunday in September in each year the standard time of each zone shall, by the retarding of one hour, be returned to the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing said zone, so that between the last Sunday in April at 2 o'clock antemeridian and the last Sunday in September at 2 o'clock antemeridian in each year the standard time in each zone shall be one hour in advance of the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing each zone, respectively.

Sec. 4. That the standard time of the first zone shall be known and designated as United States standard eastern time; that of the second zone shall be known and designated as United States standard central time; that of the third zone shall be known and designated as United States standard mountain time; that of the fourth zone shall be known and designated as United States standard Pacific time;



and that of the fifth zone shall be known and designated as United States standard Alaska time.

SEC. 5. That this act take effect and be in force from and after January 1, 1918.

SEC. 6. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 4, strike out the word "April" and insert the word "March"; on line 6, strike out the word "September" and insert the word "March"; on line 11, strike out the word "September" and insert the word "October"; on lines 24 and 25, strike out all of section 5; on page 4, line 1, strike out the figure "6" and insert the figure "5."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for one hour.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to divide the time for general debate and allow three-quarters of an hour on a side?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, if it can be agreed that at the end of the hour and a half of debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendment I shall have no objection.

Mr. ESCH. We may not use the whole three-quarters of an hour on this side.

Mr. SIMS. Would the gentleman object to that sort of an arrangement?

Mr. ESCH. No.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the bill run for one hour and a half, one half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] and the other half by myself, and that at the end of the hour and a half the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this bill be limited to one hour and a half, half of the time to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], and that at the end of the hour and a half the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And that at the end of that time amendments, of course, should be reported and voted on.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, yes; reported and voted on.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. They can be offered at any time during debate; but, of course, they will have to be offered from the desk before a vote is taken.

Mr. SIMS. I understand that to be the result, that at the end of that time any amendment that is offered can be voted on, but without debate.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, if that consent agreement is made, how will those who do not get time—and I understand the committee, who are all in favor of the bill, will use all of the time—and who wish to offer improving amendments, get a chance to discuss them?

The SPEAKER. They can not be discussed after the hour and a half is consumed.

Mr. WINGO. And one would not have an opportunity to offer them unless he got recognition.

The SPEAKER. They can be offered pending debate.

Mr. WINGO. But one would have to get the floor.

The SPEAKER. Of course in order to offer an amendment. The Chair's understanding is that debate is to run for an hour and a half and that at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage. Amendments offered during that time and pending are to be voted on at the end of that time without debate.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for an hour.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, this proposition, known as the daylight-saving bill, is a plan which is now in operation in the countries of practically all of our allies and in the enemy countries. It is in operation in Great Britain, in France, in Germany, in Austria, in Italy, in Holland, in Portugal, and in Scandinavia.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it in operation in Canada?

Mr. BORLAND. It is in operation through action of some of the provincial legislatures in some of the Provinces in Canada.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it in operation in Mexico?

Mr. BORLAND. No.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What effect will it have upon the international train schedules on those roads that run into Canada and Mexico from this country?

Mr. BORLAND. I shall speak of that matter when I come to it. It is not a new proposition, so far as the civilized world is concerned, but it has been in operation now for two full seasons. In fact, the United States is behind other first-class commercial countries in the delay in adopting this daylight-saving movement. The proposition simply consists of exchanging one hour of artificial light for one hour of natural light. It provides for advancing the clock during the period of time embraced practically between the vernal equinox and the autumnal equinox one hour.

The effect of that will be to move forward the business habits of the community one hour nearer to sunrise. In no other respect will the habits of the community or any of the schedules of hours of labor be changed, but the result of advancing the clock will be to utilize one hour of sunlight nearer to the time of sunrise and cut off one hour of artificial light at the end of the day.

Mr. PADGETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Down in my country a farmer gets up an hour before sunrise and does not quit work until an hour after dark. Would he have to get up and go to work two hours before sunrise? [Laughter.]

Mr. BORLAND. There would not be the slightest change in the habits of the gentleman's constituents. There would not be the slightest change in the habits of any gentlemen anywhere. The change is a community change, which does not affect the individual at all.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Would this daylight-saving bill affect in any way the farmer?

Mr. BORLAND. It would not.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Would he eat his dinner an hour earlier?

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, no.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Would he eat it at 1 o'clock instead of at 12?

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed, we can get along a little better. I have only 10 minutes, and I do not think we can advance very much if each gentleman asks a separate question.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. How can there be a community change, of substance, without a change of life of the individuals who compose the community?

Mr. BORLAND. I think I will answer that question as I proceed, if the gentleman pleases.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I read a very interesting article last Sunday by a person who has been very much interested in this bill, and from which I draw the conclusion that possibly the next propaganda they will start will be a change in thermometers. He suggested in this article that Congress provide special thermometers for next winter, fixing freezing at 45° F., insisting that by so doing we would save coal, contending that people heat their houses to 60 or 70, and by the new proposed winter thermometer would be led to be satisfied with less heat. Is it the intention of the gentleman to follow this bill with that kind of a bill?

Mr. BORLAND. That is a very good illustration of the argument used against this bill.

Mr. WINGO. This is from a gentleman who is in favor of this.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman is not advancing it seriously—

Mr. WINGO. I am advancing it seriously, because the magazine article was a serious argument and by a man in favor of this bill. I am not advancing that theory.

Mr. BORLAND. It evidently was not a serious argument. Nobody is going to change the laws of nature even to suit the gentleman from Arkansas. All we are going to do is to change the business habits of the community, which we regulate by clock. We go to work by the clock; we get up by the clock; we eat by the clock; we catch trains by the clock; the banks and business offices open by the clock. Now, it is perfectly apparent that it does not make much difference how much daylight there is, or how early the sunrise, it is impossible for an individual in a community to take advantage of that daylight himself except for purely recreational purposes. Some gentle-

men can get up an hour earlier if they choose, and ride horseback, play golf, or play tennis, but there is no case in which they can transact business by that added hour of the day. If they go down to their stores, their customers are not there; even their clerks have not put in an appearance. The street cars are not in operation. If they go to their offices, there are no patients or clients. The banks are not open, and the mails have not been delivered. It is utterly out of the power, in this complex age of civilization, of any individual to change the habits of a community. He can not add to the day's work to save his life, because that is fixed by the fixed habits of the community. The only way it can be done is by a power which commands the universal respect of the community, and that power is the clock.

Now, when we come to figure out exactly how the community's habits are regulated, we find they are regulated not only by the clock, but they are actually regulated by the standard time fixed by the railroads. We do not follow accurate sun time in any community in the United States, and it does not make a particle of difference to us what the accurate sun time is. We follow the standard time as fixed by the clock.

In 1883 the railroads, realizing the tremendous inconvenience of everybody in trying to follow sun time in all the different communities of the United States, through the American Association of Railroad Managers, fixed upon a standard time. They figured that there was one hour's difference for every 15 degrees of longitude, and by making a standard number of zones approximately 15 degrees in width and changing the time by the even hour they would gradually reduce the inconvenience and confusion occasioned by the dual time. So they did that. And now we have the standard time fixed by the common consent of the railroad companies, which embraces four zones in the United States based upon certain standard of meridian. Now, everybody, including the courts and the Government, have adapted themselves to this standard time. It is not the sun time in any State in the United States, not a single one, because it is reckoned west from the meridian of Greenwich, and that is only the mean standard time of the meridian of Greenwich, which is not the actual sun time any day of the year. It is the average time at which the sun crosses the meridian of Greenwich throughout the year.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. In just a moment. I would rather finish a little further. So that we are now operating under an artificial standard.

I want to impress that upon gentlemen. We are not tampering with natural laws, as my friend from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo] seems to think. We have long since passed that. While he was still in school we passed the idea of regulating our time by the movement of the sun. We have come to an artificial standard given to us by the railroads. All that we are asking here is that that standard, so accepted by the people, shall be made the United States standard.

Let me explain briefly the frame of this bill, which I drew and which was introduced by me in the House of Representatives and by Senator CALDER in the Senate. The first section adopts the standard time now in use throughout the country—established by the American Association of Railway Managers—as the standard time of the United States, and provides that the boundaries of the zones shall be fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of the common carriers. There will be no interference, therefore, with the standard time now in general use.

The second section provides that within the zones thus created the standard time of the zone shall govern the movement of all common carriers engaged in interstate commerce and shall be the official time of the United States, regulating its courts, offices, and legal proceedings done under the statutes, laws, or regulations of the Government.

Having thus fixed the official standard time of the United States, the third section provides that at 2 o'clock antemeridian of the last Sunday in March of each year the standard time of each zone shall be advanced one hour, and at 2 o'clock antemeridian of the last Sunday in October of each year the standard time of each zone shall, by the retarding of one hour, be returned to the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing such zone, so that between the last Sunday in March at 2 o'clock antemeridian and the last Sunday in October at 2 o'clock antemeridian the standard time in each zone shall be one hour in advance of the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing each zone, respectively.

It is in this third section that the daylight-saving plan occurs. During the summer months, and especially between the vernal equinox and the autumnal equinox, the days are long and the

sun rises three or four hours before the time when business begins according to the settled habits of the community. It is in this period of the early part of the day that the saving of the use of daylight can be effected by moving the business habits of the community forward one hour.

But, says some individual who prides himself upon his settled opposition to new methods: "Why can't a person rise an hour earlier in the morning if he desires to do so, without the need of a law?"

In this age of complex civilization it is manifest that no one individual can change the settled habits of the community. It is entirely possible for him to rise an hour earlier in the summer time and use that hour for recreational purposes, but in a city at least, or even in a very moderate size industrial community, he can not add that hour to his day's work. His day's work does not depend upon himself alone but upon his employer, his employees, his customers, his clients, and especially upon the arrival and departure of the mails, the opening and closing of the banks and other public offices. In order to take practical advantage of the hour of daylight, it is necessary to move the entire habits of the community by some power which everyone consults and respects.

This power is the clock as represented by the standard time. The change is made at 2 o'clock in the morning of the last Sunday in March—a time when it is manifest that traffic of all kinds is at its lowest ebb. Those who happen to be awake and at business at that hour on Sunday morning would make the change then, and the comparatively few trains which happen to be on the road would change their time as they now change it in passing from one zone into the other. The great mass of citizens, however, would not notice the change at all. When they retired to bed on Saturday night at the usual time, they would simply move their watches one hour forward, get up Sunday morning by the same watch, and practically no change would occur in their habits.

The hasty objector concludes that he himself is the only one who is going to change and that the street cars, railroads, and stores will operate on the old basis. It should be understood, however, that the trains will arrive and depart, the mails will be delivered, the street cars will run, and the banks will open and close at the same hour by the clock as under the existing habit and schedule, so that only the individual who refuses to make the change will find himself out of line with the timepiece and an hour late for everything.

The effect of this simple change is to add an hour of daylight at the beginning of the day and to cut off an hour of darkness at the close of the day. It also has the effect of providing an extra hour of daylight between the close of business in the afternoon and sunset. It confines the sleeping period more nearly to the period of actual darkness and the working and recreational period more nearly to the period of actual daylight.

This bill has been specifically indorsed by the United States Chamber of Commerce and by hundreds of organizations of business men throughout the United States. It has been urged also upon Congress by the American Federation of Labor. An especial plea for its passage has come from the advisory commission of the Council of National Defense on the ground that it is an important war measure. The medical bodies throughout the country have agreed that it is important from the standpoint of health and sanitation in removing much of the eye strain of individual workers and providing more hours of daylight for healthful recreation.

The United States Shipping Board has petitioned Congress for its passage and the Fuel Commissioner made a special plea to the President of the United States setting forth the importance of this measure in the conservation of fuel. It is manifest that all of these organizations could not unite upon a plan unless it possessed undoubted merit and was as far as possible removed from a mere fad.

We have also the result of the experience of the European countries, where it has had a practical test for the last two seasons. In both France and England it goes into operation by virtue of executive order, and if it had not fully demonstrated its usefulness as a war measure it would not have been continued through the third season of its trial.

It is, in fact, a very important war measure at this time. The United States is one of the last of the great powers to adopt this important change, and the failure of Congress to pass the law would put us out of harmony with European nations on the question of time during the summer season. This would have a serious effect upon our exchanges, our shipping, and our mail and cable communications.

The gentleman from Tennessee asked me whether this plan had been adopted in Canada and Mexico and, if not, whether our international train service would not be affected by their



failure to adopt the same plan. I am answering this a little more fully by saying that Canada has now adopted the plan in some communities and Provinces by local election. It is probable that it will be adopted there by Dominion election also following our adoption.

It is impossible to say what will be done in Mexico, but the question is not serious in any case, because it is just as feasible to change time when that occurs on international boundary as it is now to change time when that occurs on boundary between one of our existing zones of standard time.

The convenience of similar system of time, however, will appeal to the Dominion of Canada, especially in view of the example of the mother country.

The advantages of the plan are too numerous to analyze in detail. The most conspicuous is the saving in artificial light by cutting off an hour of darkness at the close of day. This results in a saving of fuel to an enormous extent in all of the great cities of the United States. Not alone is the saving in actual fuel involved, which is extremely important during this war period, but the saving in the labor of mining, transporting and handling the fuel, and in operating and providing plants for the production of artificial light.

The advantages of the plan in the way of health and recreation are apparent at a glance. All of the indoor workers will have an extra hour of daylight after the close of their work, which will be of the greatest value in building up their bodily health and strength. The extra hour of daylight can be used also for military training, but more especially for home gardening.

The cultivation of home gardens during the coming season will be a very important element in the conservation of food supplies. The extent to which our population can be fed by perishable food raised at home will be an important factor in winning the war. Home gardening not only utilizes the surplus labor and energies of the family but relieves to that extent the demand upon labor for the farms where there exists now an alarming shortage.

The production of food at home also relieves the strain upon transportation and storage facilities of the country and releases a certain amount of labor and energy which can be devoted to taking the surplus of our food products abroad. The National War Garden Commission, which is very strongly in favor of this bill, calculates that the total amount of time the extra hour of daylight would add to the working time of the 5,000,000 war gardeners which they estimate will be this year would be 910,000,000 hours, and that each garden can grow vegetables equivalent in food value to 126 pounds of beef and 93 pounds of bread. This, they estimate, would save enough meat to feed an army of a million men for 503 days.

Altogether the advantages of the daylight-saving plan are so obvious and the disadvantages, if any, so slight, that this House will do well to respond to the urgent demands of the commercial interests of the country, to the advice of the medical fraternity, and to the request of all those who are engaged in the war work of the Government, and pass this measure, placing the United States in harmony with the practice of our allies, and meeting to that extent the efficient operations of our active enemies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to renew my request. I ask unanimous consent that the debate be continued for an hour and a half, one-half of the time to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], and at the conclusion the previous question shall be ordered on the bill and all amendments thereto.

Mr. WINGO. What disposition is there to allow time?

Mr. SIMS. My purpose is to yield to those who oppose the bill as well as those who favor it.

Mr. WINGO. We could not get time under the rule.

Mr. SIMS. I had no control over the time on the rule.

Mr. WINGO. But the gentleman has time now.

Mr. SIMS. I will yield from the time in my control.

Mr. WINGO. Is the debate to be on the bill?

Mr. SIMS. The rule says it shall be considered under the general rules of the House.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. Has the committee the power, after the House has decided the amount of debate to be had on this bill, to fix another and a different time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We are not in the committee now. We are in the House.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. FESS. Under the rule under which we are operating the Chairman has the right to move the previous question at the end of the hour?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. So that if we do not get the hour and a half we may be cut down to an hour?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman from Tennessee is an experienced man in the House, and he knows that that would not be fair or practicable.

Mr. SIMS. I am anxious to get through.

Mr. WINGO. I have asked the gentleman for time. He has indicated that the committee wants all the time.

Mr. SIMS. I will state to the gentleman that I will yield him five minutes of my time that I have to yield.

Mr. WINGO. Very well. Some one suggests that that is all I need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asks unanimous consent that the debate be limited to one hour and a half, and that at the conclusion of that time the debate shall be exhausted and the previous question shall be ordered on the bill and all amendments thereto, and that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee and one-half be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH].

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I assume that the time taken by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] shall be deducted.

Mr. SIMS. Part of it shall be deducted from this side.

Mr. LONDON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman from Tennessee eliminate that part of his request which relates to the five-minute rule. We should be free to offer amendments and to discuss them.

Mr. SIMS. You can offer any amendment, and it can be voted on at the conclusion of the hour and a half.

Mr. LONDON. But can we not have opportunity to speak in favor of an amendment as it is offered?

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman gets time he can do that.

Mr. LONDON. Members desire to take time on their amendments. I object unless that can be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York objects. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask this question: I desire to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] 25 minutes, to be yielded by him to such gentlemen as he sees proper, without my losing the floor, if I can do that. If not, I will yield five minutes to gentlemen in such amount as they may request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the circumstances, the gentleman can yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, if he desires to do so.

Mr. SIMS. Then, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted, from the hour I have got to use, to yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], to be yielded by him without my losing the floor and the opportunity to make my motion demanding the previous question on the bill and all committee amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to yield 25 minutes of the hour in his control to the gentleman from Wisconsin, to be yielded by him as he sees proper, this to be done without his losing any privileges which he is entitled to use as in charge of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. LONDON. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman the right to do that?

Mr. BORLAND. Could not the gentleman from Wisconsin or any other gentleman on his own side claim an hour in his own right?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, as I remember the rules of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee can yield such time of his hour as he desires for debate without losing his rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is right.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] yields for amendments, he loses the floor for all purposes.

Mr. SIMS. The question is, Can I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] and have him reyield the time?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Unless he restricted the time to debate, he could not.

Mr. SIMS. I will restrict it to debate. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin 25 minutes for debate, with the privilege

to him of reyielding such of it as he sees proper to other Members of the House.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the rules the gentleman has no right to yield time except to those who desire to occupy the floor. The gentleman has no right under the rules to yield time to some one else and have that person yield part of that time. He can only yield the time to one who desires to occupy the floor, and it occurs to me that this can be done in the same way by designating those to whom he desires to yield time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is incorrect in that. The gentleman can yield 25 minutes if he sees proper to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the gentleman from Wisconsin can yield part of that, if he sees proper, to others.

Mr. SIMS. I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch].

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Chair is wrong on that ruling; not that I care about this proposition. It is entirely immaterial. But that rule should not be established, because it is in violation of the rules. I am perfectly willing in this instance that the gentleman from Wisconsin shall have all of the time that the gentleman from Tennessee desires to give him; but I do object, Mr. Speaker, to the Speaker establishing the precedent here that is contrary to the rules.

Mr. RUBEN. Regular order!

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, what is the precedent that the gentleman from Iowa thinks is being established that is contrary to the rule? Under the familiar precedents of the House, the gentleman who has the hour can yield such portions of that time as he pleases to another Member.

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly. I think he has a perfect right to yield 25 minutes of that time to the gentleman from Wisconsin if the gentleman from Wisconsin occupies the 25 minutes. That would be all right. If he does not, he must yield back the balance of his time not occupied by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman from Wisconsin, practically speaking, can allow other gentlemen to speak in his time and we can not stop him. Nobody can stop him.

Mr. DOWELL. Not if the gentleman from Tennessee yields the time?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No; the gentleman from Tennessee need not yield the time. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, for instance, 25 minutes. The gentleman from Wisconsin takes the floor. Somebody asks the gentleman from Wisconsin if he may interrupt him. The gentleman from Wisconsin allows him to interrupt him and to proceed for 5 minutes, if he wants, or 10 minutes. Nobody can stop that.

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly; with the gentleman from Wisconsin still occupying the floor.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes; he has the technical right to the floor.

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. So that that works out, as a practical proposition, as a yielding of time by the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. That is correct, certainly; but not in the manner in which it was suggested.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi). That is the way in which the Chair intended it. So the statement of the Chair was correct. To whom does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. SIMS. I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] for debate only.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield to me five minutes?

Mr. ESCH. I have enough requests to take up the 25 minutes without yielding any more to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SIMS. Perhaps, possibly, before the debate is over we may get an opportunity for these other gentlemen to be heard.

Mr. BORLAND. Can the gentleman from Tennessee yield me five minutes?

Mr. SIMS. That leaves us only 10 minutes on this side. I would rather yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] than to any other man who is not a member of the committee, because he introduced the bill.

Mr. DOWELL. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent for more time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] may proceed for five minutes, the time not to be counted as a part of the hour of the gentleman from Tennessee, and the gentleman from Tennessee to lose no rights by reason of it.

Mr. DOWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the debate be extended 20 minutes beyond the hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 20 minutes beyond the hour.

Mr. SIMS. I would have to object to that without an agreement that the previous question should be considered as ordered at the expiration of the time for debate.

Mr. BROWNING. I object, unless that agreement is made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey objects—

Mr. BROWNING. Unless the agreement is made as suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DOWELL. I will incorporate that into the request for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his request.

Mr. DOWELL. That 20 minutes time beyond the hour be granted, and that the previous question be ordered at the end of the hour and twenty minutes.

Mr. SIMS. On the bill and all amendments.

Mr. DOWELL. On the bill and all amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the debate be extended 20 minutes beyond the hour to which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is entitled, and that at the close of that time the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. HASTINGS. Regular order!

Mr. SIMS. I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch].

Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes, not to be taken out of the hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for five minutes, not to be taken out of the hour. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I object.

Mr. SIMS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] 25 minutes for the purposes of debate, without losing the floor.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, this bill divides the territory of the United States into what are known as five zones, approximating the zones now established by the railroad companies, with the right in the Interstate Commerce Commission to delimit these zones so as to make the delimitations as convenient as possible to traffic conditions. Under the present system there have been many cases of inconvenience because the limits of the zones were not definite. Under the powers granted by the bill the Interstate Commerce Commission will fix these zones. Under present conditions I know of a city in central zone territory which as to one railroad uses eastern time and as to another railroad central time, to the great confusion of the traveling public. There ought to be no such confusion. With the power herein granted to the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix the zones, basing them largely upon the junction points, there will be no confusion. Daylight saving is not a new matter. It is not an untried experiment. Twelve or thirteen nations have adopted it. Every European nation at war has adopted it, and not one of them has seen fit to go back to the old system. The fact that it has proven a success in every country that has tried it is a sufficient justification for this country to adopt it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. For a question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In those countries that have adopted it, have there been any changes in the hours of labor for the factory workers?

Mr. ESCH. No; not as I understand.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is, they are run by the clock, as before?

Mr. ESCH. Does the gentleman mean in the number of hours worked by the people?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not mean the number of hours of work. I mean in the time at which they go to work.

Mr. ESCH. They begin an hour earlier, based upon sun time, so that they get through an hour earlier in the afternoon, and that is one of the main purposes of this proposition, that the laboring people can get through at 4 o'clock in the larger centers, whereas they now get through at 5 o'clock, and can devote the balance of the afternoon and the early evening to gardening, other outside work, amusements, and so on.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If this bill shall pass here, I wish to know whether the factories in this country will continue to run by the clock as it now stands—that is, by sun time, using that as a nearly accurate expression—or whether it means that



where they now begin work at 7 o'clock, they will then go to work at 8 o'clock?

Mr. DOWELL. No; they will go to work at 7 o'clock.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Seven o'clock as it is now or 8 o'clock as it is now? In other words, whether they will change the hour of the clock at which the whistles will blow? Where they now blow at 7 o'clock to call the people to work, will the whistles then blow at 8 o'clock?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I can not yield at this time. Mr. Speaker, this fact ought to be remembered, that nations that have adopted this proposition in Europe are located in latitudes higher than a great portion of the United States. The nearer we get to the equator the more even the nights and days are, and therefore in the southern part of the United States, possibly in Florida and southern Texas and southern California, they will not be able to save as much sunlight during the months covered by this bill as will the people living in the Northern States. They therefore may not get the full benefit of the act. But it is to be remembered that most of France, practically all of England, Norway, and Sweden, and a great portion of Germany are, in point of latitude, really north of New York City. Therefore their days covered by the daylight act are very much longer than they would be in the southern latitudes. However, in the United States there is scarcely a section that will not be benefited by this act. It will save time; it will save light; it will save fuel; it will increase the comforts of thousands of people. It will aid in the prosecution of the war, and all these are factors which justify Congress in adopting this act.

I will now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, "man's work is from sun to sun." That was true in the old days when there were no clocks. Husbandmen and sailors started with sunrise and that began their day. We go to work by the clock. We find in the summer that the sun gets up earlier and the clock time does not go ahead with the sun. Usually we begin our hours of labor in the factory at 7 o'clock. The result is that in the summer three good hours of morning daylight are lost in many countries, hours that men ought to use so as to get their afternoons to themselves.

It is comparatively a very short time since there were any clocks, and the errors of clock time are as conspicuous as its novelty.

The sailor had a half-hour sand glass which he turned over at sunrise, and when it was out sounded one bell, repeating this until he got to eight bells, and then beginning over again. Short watches of two hours in the evening, called the "dog watch," arranged for the change of men on deck. The first clocks were poor things. They finally became good enough timekeepers or chronometers to enable the mariner to guess at longitude, although as late as 1798 Vancouver could not tell his longitude within a degree, and in 1825, the beginning point of the survey of Alaska, allowed a margin of two degrees of longitude to cover errors. Those who travel by sea know how the clock is changed every day according to the longitude and the time when the sun crosses the meridian.

The sun itself is nearer the earth in winter and moves faster, so that the length of the days varies during the year, and our clock time is called "mean time," being an average of the sun time during the year.

Since the introduction of factories and fixed working days the people of cities where they had clocks began to work by clock time, while the farmer in summer still gets up with the sun in order to get his harvest in.

The trouble with clock time is that the whole community gets used to starting different sorts of work at 6, 7, or 8 in the morning, while daylight begins much earlier, but common agreement has the force of law. The workman would consider it an imposition to be asked to begin an hour earlier by the clock. In families where there are servants breakfast can not be had until the servants are up and the milkman has called. Markets, stores, banks, factories, libraries, railroads, trolleys, and all other machinery of civilization have each its own timetable, and each one depends upon the other. A commuter can not get to town until the train runs, and more trains are run at hours which suit the convenience of the community. A single man can get up earlier and go it alone at anything that interests him. The great historian and student, Thiers, used to rise at 3 and get six hours' work in his study before he went to business. After dinner he appeared for a few minutes at the official reception and then went to bed. But most men and women must go with the crowd, and there can be no change, no matter how beneficial, which is not a matter of common consent and which is not acceded to by all.

This bill, as a practical matter, proposes to put the clock forward in summer so that it will ring 7 o'clock at what we now call 6 o'clock, and factory and work generally will begin more nearly with the day. A few of us get daylight for ourselves by rising early and getting to work before the rest start, and if you start with daylight I may not have daylight for my morning exercise. Thus it is not true, as some of us have thought, that every man can arrange his time for himself.

My friends, the Colgate Co., in Jersey City, tried daylight saving. They got the workmen to agree to come an hour earlier, so as to get an earlier workday and have the afternoon to themselves. Everyone liked the plan, but they found it would not work well because the morning trains did not run frequently in the early hours. Everybody must make the change at once.

Railroad travel has become an absolute necessity. American railroads run east and west, and in 24 hours, from New York to Chicago, the time changes by more than an hour. The difficulties attending the change of time with each degree of longitude were of little importance as long as railroads were short, but as the system ran 3,000 miles, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, these frequent changes became unbearable, and to make travel safe it was necessary that the time should not be in doubt and that the engineer's watch should be a law from the beginning to the end of his run. Hence came the adoption of the system of zones, in which the time changes an hour at certain points, preferably, whenever possible, at junction points, such as Pittsburgh, Buffalo, or Omaha. These railroad zones are described in the bill and are made subject to the rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The time set by the railroads has been very generally adopted by the various cities and towns throughout the Union and followed abroad. There is no law for this, and it is merely a matter of common consent. It is only one of the instances of how much can be done without law and by common consent, habit, and agreement.

Perhaps the bill might have stopped with simply saying that railroad time should be put forward, and governed in this way. The present standard time exists by mere agreement between the railroads, which changed the hours all over the country so as to avoid altering the time with every few miles of travel. The system works very well, although in some places standard time is a half hour ahead of the sun and in others a half hour behind. In one gentleman's district—Mr. COOPER of West Virginia—the sheriff, following the almanac and railroad time, closed the polls 20 minutes before sunset because the sun ought to have set at that time. [Laughter.]

It is not certain whether towns will feel at liberty as they are now to adopt what time they please. Savannah found it inconvenient to use Chicago time, and its business now runs by New York time, although the railroads run by Chicago time. The same thing is true in Ohio. This is a country of local independence.

The action of these towns is a proof of the practical character of the bill. Chicago time was 37 minutes slower than Savannah sun time, and it was found that a day's work would not be done before dark if it was to begin and end by Chicago time. The workmen certainly would not start an hour earlier by the clock, and so Savannah set the clock forward an hour, just as we are doing now. This governed all the affairs of the town, but everybody knew that if a railroad train started at 1 o'clock, it meant 2 o'clock by the Savannah time.

The advantages of getting up with the sun are so great that some arrangement to catch up with daylight in the summer has become absolutely necessary in time of war. "Early to bed and early to rise makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise." It will give the workmen time in the afternoon, whether he work in the factory or the office. The children will have longer holiday after school. Men can go to their homes and be with their families. They can take care of gardens, and gardens and food production are now an absolute necessity. It will save gas and electric light, and therefore fuel. The figures of this saving are estimated in many millions. The system was adopted last year by England, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Portugal, and this year by Australia and Iceland, but, of course, it was reversed in Australia. An hour of daylight to 20,000,000 workers and 100,000,000 people is of inestimable value. The change is a practical one and will only be made twice a year. It will shorten one night in the spring by an hour and lengthen one night in the fall by an hour, and the only objection that has been made is that some through trains will be an hour late one night when the time is changed. Late trains are not uncommon.

This legislation does not attempt to change time. Actual time can not be changed by legislation. It changes only the artificial time which we have. What is called "mean time" is an artificial compromise. Standard time is an entirely artificial agreement by which one place takes the time of another so as to keep to equal hours and even time throughout certain zones. The language of the bill if carefully read provides that the railroad time shall be made an hour earlier during the summer and this could have been done by an order of the Railroad Director without any statute. It likewise says that United States offices shall be operated by this statutory time and that United States statutes as to time shall be construed to refer to that time. When the act provides that it shall determine "the time in which any act shall or shall not be performed by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States," the courts may limit the word "jurisdiction" so that the enactment may not extend for all purposes to all United States territory, but only to matters within United States constitutional jurisdiction. But common consent will do the rest. The people have generally adopted railroad standard time and the people will adopt United States standard time because it gets them nearer to the real day. We follow the motto, "Work while it is called to-day." This is a practical matter. It does not settle theoretical time. It settles the practical question of when a man shall work by saying that our arbitrary time shall follow the seasons.

It is of no consequence whether the bill technically goes too far in saying that everybody shall be bound by the new time, because, although time and tide wait for no man, and the sun does not stand still or go ahead for the American Congress, as it did once for Joshua [laughter], it is beyond all question that on the whole this bill will work for the practical advantage of the community, and I support it heartily, whether for peace or war.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, the full merit of this proposed legislation has been obscured behind the clouds of ridicule and lack of understanding, some of the darkness which this bill seeks to eliminate. This measure does not propose to change either the laws of nature or the habits of man. But it does seek to alter the conditions under which we work and play.



In answer to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], let me say that, briefly, the setting forward of our clocks neither lengthens or shortens the hours of toll. The working day under the new arrangement of time remains the same, so far as the actual length in hours of that day is concerned. It merely means that the working day will commence one hour nearer to sunrise and terminate one hour further away from sunset than at present. And as a corollary the time for recreation will begin one hour earlier and end one hour earlier. That is all there is to the proposition in its simple analysis. In other words, we merely borrow 60 minutes from the afternoon and loan them to the morning.

This will enable us to do more in the early hours of the day and then have more time for recreation in the afternoon, while it is yet light. The same amount of time for work and the same amount of time for play will be ours as at present, the only difference being that our work and our pleasures will be consummated in daylight. It means that, accomplishing the same, we cut off one hour of darkness, thereby benefiting health and saving that much artificial light and the corresponding amount of fuel to produce that light. I am heartily in favor of the proposition.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] two minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the daylight-saving proposal is almost the only thing since the summer of 1914 on which the entente powers of Europe and the central powers have been able to agree. The forerunner of the movement in the world was Germany, which passed a law on the 6th of April, 1916, putting forward the clocks one hour. Within three months of that time the following countries of Europe had adopted the daylight-saving plan: Holland, Austria, Turkey, England, France, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I have not the time. In 1917 this list was increased by the addition of Australia and Iceland. I believe that in the New World Nova Scotia has set the United States a good example. England was actuated by considerations growing out of the war in adopting this policy. She found that she could effect an enormous saving in coal for military and naval purposes if she adopted the daylight-saving plan. It is said that in 1917 she saved nearly \$3,000,000 as a result of the daylight-saving plan, and thereby released the equivalent in coal for her war vessels and for her war industries. As a war measure and as a peace measure I favor this bill. When I was in Great Britain in November I made full inquiries into the workings of the daylight-saving movement. Everywhere I went I was told that it had become an integral part of the fabric and life of the people of Great Britain, and that they would not, if they could, even consider going back to the old régime. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have any particular objection to this bill; I just decline to take it seriously. I do not know that it is going to help anyone and I do not know that it will hurt anybody. I suppose I would not have taken any time except that I want to remove the impression that I am inclined to "pester," as some folks say, my good friend from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, Mr. SIMS. I would not think of that, because I am very fond of the gentleman from Tennessee, and if the House will permit me I shall tell the reason why. He is the first real live Congressman that I ever saw. I remember when I was a barefooted boy in his district he was pointed out to me as he walked along the road as a Congressman. That morning I had gone to work at daylight—not by the clock—and I was throwing up sweet-potato hills with a hoe, the meanest work that a boy ever did, unless it be "suckering" tobacco; and those of you who were raised in Tennessee and Kentucky know what that is. So ever since that time as a barefoot boy when I saw him, my first real Congressman, I have been exceedingly fond of him and have watched with pride his steady rise to his present great influence and high standing in the House, and when I get "naughty" with him it is simply the naughtiness of a young man to an elderly man whom he loves and respects. God bless him, I hope he will remain in Congress for many years to lead us by his wisdom and cheer us with his graciousness.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is one of the most ingenious, hard-working Members of this body. He is always serious about everything, and he thought that I wanted to repeal the laws of nature or alter them. That is not what I am trying to do. He is the one that is trying to make the

change. I was serious when I told him that I read a magazine article last Sunday proposing a winter thermometer.

I do not recall the name of the gentleman who wrote it, but if I can find the article I am going to ask the privilege of putting it in the RECORD, because it was a serious article, advocating that Congress provide for a winter thermometer and fix the freezing point at 45° Fahrenheit, on the serious theory that people generally try to keep their apartments and houses at between 60 and 70 degrees of heat, and they could look at the thermometers and be fooled, and in that way save fuel next winter. I have as much respect for that proposal as I have for this. Mr. Speaker, you can not change the habits of a Nation, and that is what you are trying to do by this legislation. A majority of the men who advocate this character of legislation have not seen the sun rise in 20 years [applause and laughter], and they will not see it if you pass this bill. This bill is for the relief of the slackers of the Nation who are too lazy to get up early. If it will get them out of bed earlier and get them to their offices at 9 o'clock instead of 10 o'clock, it may not do any harm, and may do some good.

But the great mass of the toiling people of this country will go on getting up before or at daylight. This is simply a bill to deceive men who are too lazy to get up, and have not the will power to set the alarm clock earlier. If you want to save daylight, why do you not run up the clocks two hours instead of one? You can do it. You have plenty of opportunity during the summer months to get up two hours earlier and use the daylight. These men who traipse around here at night are not going to bed any earlier, and they will not get up earlier if you pass this.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The thing I am concerned about in this bill is, and I know the gentleman represents an agricultural district as well as I do, is not the beginning of the day but the end.

Mr. WINGO. There will not be any end.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Of course, stores and every other business that opens an hour earlier will close an hour earlier. Now, would that not inconvenience people who work not by the number of hours in the day, but until the sun goes down?

Mr. WINGO. No; I do not think it would make any difference. I think there are a great many people in this country that will not pay any attention to this law; and people will go around here in the city of Washington and ask, "What time is it?" "Do you mean the congressional time or the standard time," will be the reply. The farmer will have a good laugh over our tinkering with the clocks. We have tinkered with everything; we have tried to repeal the law of supply and demand, now you are tinkering with the clocks, and if you keep up this foolishness, some fool will ask us to suspend the law of gravity and regulate the period of gestation. [Laughter.]

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman tell me at what time Congress will convene?

Mr. WINGO. I do not know.

Mr. KING. Congress is supposed to convene at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. WINGO. It will convene at 12 o'clock "congressional" time, or at 11 o'clock real time.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will it interfere with the time of getting up on Sundays?

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman is constituted as I am, it will not. I repeat, I am not so much opposed to this legislation, as I can not take it seriously. We should not be wasting our time on such bills, but should go on with the war-finance bill, the great supply bills for the Army and Navy, and other measures for speeding up the war. While our boys are fighting in the trenches we are here like a lot of school boys "tinkering" with the clocks. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], a member of the committee.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I, like some other gentlemen who have spoken in regard to this bill, at first regarded the subject with some levity, and thought the matter might be futile and that it was chimerical, but the longer I have thought about it and the more closely I have examined it the more I am convinced that there is practical utility in it.

The best proof of a pudding is the eating thereof, and the very best proof of the business sense of the world in regard to a measure is what the business men say. Now, this measure has been advocated by the National Chamber of Commerce, representing 450,000 business interests in this country. That in itself, in my judgment, would be conclusive proof of the merits of the matter. But further than that—and I have so little time I can not discuss the merits of the bill—permit me



to observe to this distinguished assembly that this very measure, according to Mr. Brunet, who is a skilled public-service engineer in Providence, R. I., is estimated to save \$40,000,000 in fuel in the United States in one year. We have cried for fuel; we say that there is a scarcity of it. We all know we need it, and need it all the time, and if that item alone is to be taken into consideration, it would be a moving consideration to me.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. I must decline to be interrupted.

There were \$10,000,000 saved in five and one-half months in France for fuel alone. There were \$12,000,000 saved in England for five months and a half in fuel for light and heating purposes. There were 200,000 tons of coal saved in the city of London in the period of five and a half months by their daylight saving.

There are to-day about 102,000,000 people in this country outside of the territorial expansion that we have in the Philippines and in the Sandwich Islands. Of those we can safely say there are about 20,000,000 men and boys and other male labor engaged in our manufacturing industries and upon our farms. Allow one hour per day in these four or five months as the saving in time by the advancing of the clock, by having them get up earlier and working at that time, and you save all those hours. If there ever was a time in the history of the Nation when we needed productive farm labor, incessantly and intensely, this is the time.

Some gentlemen say we can not change nature, that we can not change the habits of the people. I admit you can not do that by legislation, but you can do it by the moral effect of the legislation and you can do it by the example that has been set.

Now, this matter can not be accomplished unless there is a concentration of effort. If one establishment in Pittsburgh says, "We will have daylight-saving regulation," and another says, "We will not," there is no concentration of effort. If one city says it will do so and another city says it will not do so, again there is the competition and no concentration. But if you have a national law to the effect, although it is not penal, although there is no penalty attached to the violation thereof, and although it is nothing except moral suasion and example, if you have a national law and it is general and universal, you have a concentrated effort, and that is what the bill does and nothing else.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Has this experiment been tried out in England under war conditions?

Mr. DEWALT. It has, sir.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And is the report from England to the effect that it has been satisfactory?

Mr. DEWALT. Satisfactory, and completely so. They saved \$12,000,000 in fuel in five months' time.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. How will they save fuel?

Mr. DEWALT. By reason of the fact that if they go to work at one hour earlier in the daylight they do not require light. The coal is used in producing electric light.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Mississippi ask a moment ago how this would save any fuel. I will answer his question. In the cities and towns of the country a great many places are required now to close at 11 o'clock at night. If these places should put the clock ahead one hour they will really close at what now is 10 o'clock, and thus save an hour's consumption of fuel for the purpose of artificial light. It will save, also, an hour's consumption of fuel in millions of places for the production of heat. And these two savings will together save millions in money.

Now, here in my hand is the answer to the gentleman's question as to what the saving has been in London, England. Mr. Robert Garland, the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, as chairman of the daylight-saving committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, testified before the Senate committee. By the way, the Senate passed this bill unanimously. This is what he said:

I believe, also, Senators that if you will ascertain from the British or the French commissions, from any of the members who are here, they will say that they not only are satisfied to have this in time of war, but they will also continue it in times of peace. Those are the verdicts we get from these various countries, and we have corresponded with chambers of commerce in Great Britain; we have statistics and reports from the main cities, such as London, Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow, and other cities, as well as Belfast, in Ireland. We have reports from Vienna; we have reports from Berlin; we have reports from Paris. In England alone, in the short term of five and one-half months, they

saved in fuel \$12,000,000 in our money, and in France \$10,000,000. It means economy, it means efficiency, it means physical recreation for our people, and it means farm gardening to a very much larger extent than we have to-day, because it gives the men, women, and children that extra hour, and that is the one thing I wish to impress upon you.

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question asked a few minutes ago by another gentleman, it is sufficient to say that where shops now open at 7 in the morning by the clock they will continue to open at 7 by the clock—

Mr. PADGETT. But that will be 6 o'clock.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That will make no difference at all. They will work the same number of hours, but they will quit one hour earlier, and therefore will consume less fuel in the evening for artificial light. Moreover, the places of amusement, all the theaters and countless other places, though closing at the same hour by the clock, will really be closing one hour earlier, and thus require less fuel for heat and light.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] said that he could not take this bill seriously, and yet it presents a subject so serious and important that England, France, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Australia, Iceland, and Bermuda have considered it, have all adopted the plan proposed by this bill, and, according to official reports, with most gratifying results. It would seem as if the gentleman from Arkansas could afford at least to consider the bill seriously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I would have liked to ask the gentleman a question for information.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROSE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, when I first began to consider this question of daylight saving I was disposed to believe with my friend from Kentucky, Mr. THOMAS, but since that time I have given some consideration to the measure and am now heartily in favor of the provisions of the pending bill.

At a meeting composed of men representing farmers, business and professional men, and industrial establishments, held in the city of Johnstown, Pa., recently, resolutions were adopted favoring the daylight-saving bill and urging its enactment, a copy of the same having been forwarded to me and mention made thereof in the Record.

In a community such as that in which I live, composed largely of industrial workers, it has been found that in times like the present emergency men are very glad to be able to leave their employment one hour sooner and devote that hour in their war gardens, and many of our men are doing such work right now. Those of us who have had no experience whatever with men employed in industrial establishments have no conception what the cessation of daily employment one hour earlier in the evening means. At this time of the year men who are employed at day work are required to eat their morning and evening meal by artificial light. By the change now proposed, the daylight saving will work a wonderful change in the evening and furnish opportunity to vastly increase the raising of food products. I am in sympathy with the arguments already adduced in favor of this measure and hope that there will not be one dissenting vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, when I first heard of the daylight-saving proposition I thought it was a little strange that people could not agree, if they wanted to, to get up an hour earlier without changing the clock, but the more I have looked into the matter the more I have understood that if you want to change the habits of people you have to change the clock. After all, there is a good deal that is arbitrary about our methods of reckoning time, and clocks are rarely exactly right anywhere. A day is the time it takes the earth to turn around on its axis, and just why it should be divided into 24 parts called hours, I do not know. It comes down to us from some ancient method of reckoning. The 24 hours, 1 hour to every 15° of the circle, do not work out exactly right, and there is a difference of some 4 minutes, I believe, between what is called solar time and sidereal or astronomical time. Then the earth does not turn over exactly 365 times while it is going around the sun in a year, but about 365½ times, so we have to add a day once in four years in February to make the years come out right in the long run. The months are supposed to come from the revolutions of the moon, but to make them come out right in

a year some have been given 30 days and some 31 days, and one 28 days, except once in four years, when it has 29. There is a good deal that is arbitrary about it all, rather than scientific. In the doctrinaire days of the French Revolution they tried to change a good deal of this, and were going to have it all arranged on the decimal system, with 10 months in a year and 10 days in a week, and I have forgotten whether they tried 10 hours in a day or not—but, anyway, it did not last. It was real, genuine revolution, however, and one evidence that the Russian revolutionists, the bolsheviks, are not the real thing is shown in the fact that they have not tried to reform the calendar, though the Russian calendar needs it as much as some other things Russian.

The division of the United States into time belts 15 degrees, or an hour, apart is arbitrary, but so convenient and workable that ever since the railroads adopted it in 1883 it has been generally accepted by everybody, and I have been very much surprised in reading the hearings on this bill to find that the standard-time belts have never before been given the sanction of law. The fact that they were generally adopted without any law shows that you can work great reforms without passing laws, though the fashion nowadays is to pass a law for everything, and this bill to turn all the clocks ahead an hour on March 31 caps the climax of the present fashion. It is nevertheless a workable proposition and will undoubtedly save daylight and fuel, a matter of prime importance during these strenuous war times. Under the present standard-time system there are places where the clocks are nearly an hour faster than the real sun time, and the people in those places are to-day complacently getting up at 5 because the clock says 6 without knowing the difference. That proves the value of the plan without drawing on the experience of European countries. My friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo], says you can not change the habits of the people by law. The answer to that is that the habits of the people in the matter of getting out of bed and getting into bed and going to work were changed when the standard-time system was adopted.

Mr. Speaker, it may seem an exaggeration to say that there are places where people are to-day getting up at 5 because the clock says it is 6, but Cleveland, Ohio, is an example. Travelers know that as you go westward on the New York Central or the Erie railroad time changes to central time at Buffalo. You set your watch an hour back on leaving that city. Suppose you arrive at Cleveland, some five hours by train west of Buffalo, at 6 o'clock. You will find the clocks in the city set at 7 o'clock. After trying central time a while the people of Cleveland decided, as a matter largely of daylight saving, to reckon by the eastern standard of the seventy-fifth meridian instead of the central time of the ninetieth meridian, which is considerably west of Chicago and not far from St. Louis. As Cleveland is about at longitude 82, its clocks were about 28 minutes slow by central standard time and are 32 minutes fast by eastern time. They found that everything went along better with the clocks indicating a half hour later than the actual time rather than a half hour earlier.

In my district eastern standard time is practically the same as actual time. The seventy-fifth meridian is the meridian that passes through Philadelphia, and it passes through Sullivan County, N. Y., at Lackawaxen, a little junction point on the Erie Railroad. Port Jervis, which is in Orange County and about the westernmost point in my district, is about 18 minutes of longitude east of this point. Its clocks are therefore a minute and some seconds only slower than actual time. The seventy-fourth meridian passes through the Hudson River, between the cities of Newburgh and Beacon, and clock time in those places and in Poughkeepsie is just 4 minutes behind the actual time—that is, behind what it would be if eastern standard time were reckoned from the seventy-fourth instead of the seventy-fifth meridian west longitude. Millerton, which is the easternmost place in my district, is about at longitude 73° 30', and its clocks are therefore about 6 minutes slow. When you get over to Boston, Mass., eastern standard time is some 16 minutes slow, and at Eastport, Me., longitude 67°, it is 32 minutes slow. It will be a particularly good thing for those far eastern points to set their clocks an hour ahead during the spring and summer, but it will also be a good thing everywhere else. Our time standard after Easter Sunday till October will be sixtieth meridian time, the meridian of far eastern Nova Scotia.

It is expected that the enactment of this law will lead to a good deal more of food production, particularly by small gardeners in the suburbs of the smaller cities and villages, and I believe that expectation is warranted. It will be a pretty lazy individual who will not make some good use of the extra hour of

the afternoon and evening. How it will work out with the genuine early risers, of whom there are some in every city and village—people who have been accustomed to doing half a day's work before breakfast—I am not so sure. They have always been daylight savers, like the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers are the real daylight savers. They have been getting up early and going to bed early for generations, and that is why so many of them are healthy, wealthy, and wise. This bill is designed to give the city people equal advantages. They will not get up an hour earlier without this little scheme to fool them into thinking that it is an hour later than it really is, but when they once get started at it they will all be glad of it.

I have been interested in this proposition for several years, and, incidentally, Mr. Colgate, of Colgate & Co., who has tried the plan in his factory at Jersey City with great success, in spite of somewhat unsatisfactory train service, lives in my district and has written me several times about it, and I have been interested in Senator CALDER's efforts, which are now to be crowned with success. Chambers of commerce and many manufacturers and business men in my district have favored the daylight-saving bill, and I have no doubt that it will be passed without much opposition and will be entirely successful. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLNEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any legislation that has been more universally demanded than the daylight-saving bill. This bill was passed by the Senate early last summer. I am glad that the time has been extended by the House committee from five to seven months.

I was one of a committee of three Congressmen to visit the White House last summer in the interest of this bill, the other two Members being the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], the author of the bill. The President told us that he needed no conversion to the idea of daylight saving. Back 30 or 40 years ago, when it was the custom to work from dawn until darkness, there was a young chap working in a woolen mill, working 12 hours a day. He requested his employer for a day off. His employer asked him for what reason. He said, "I work 12 hours a day and at the end of the day I am fatigued, and when Sunday comes I sleep all day. I want a day off so that I can see what the daylight looks like."

This will be of tremendous benefit not only to those athletically inclined, who play golf and tennis, but to all the industrial workers of this country. It has been shown that in England in the few months of experiment it has saved \$2,500,000.

By unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD letters from Marcus A. Marks, president of the Borough of Manhattan, and from Sidney Colgate, of Colgate & Co., who has tried this out in private industry with great success.

The letters are as follows:

NATIONAL DAYLIGHT SAVING ASSOCIATION,  
New York City, January 28, 1918.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OLNEY: Answering your kind lines of 21st, just received, I enclose my most recent summing up of the arguments for daylight saving.

Experiences in single cities, like Cleveland and Detroit, while usually satisfactory, do not touch the present movement, which is a summer proposition (Apr. 28 to Sept. 29), and which is to be not local but universal in this country, and which will in turn bring us into harmony with Europe, where daylight saving is also a summer regulation.

In the winter there is no daylight saving by pushing clocks forward, because you lose as much by the darkness in earlier rising as you gain by retiring earlier.

We have studied this carefully for two years and feel certain of ground, as stated in Pest article. Glad you will help push this into the light, I remain,

Cordially, yours,

MARCUS A. MARKS.

COLGATE & Co.,  
New York, January 26, 1918.

HON. RICHARD OLNEY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. OLNEY: I am inclosing copy of a statement which I have just sent to the Outing Publishing Co. I think it is exactly what you want, and it will be all right for you to use any or all of it in any address that you may make before the House, and you may use my name and that of our company in connection with it.

We are heart and soul in favor of daylight saving. It would, no doubt, now be considered a war measure, but I am convinced of the fact that if our Nation tries it it will never give it up; it will be one of the blessings which will come to future generations through this war.

I thank you for your interest, and if there is anything further that I can do to help you in this matter please do not hesitate to call on me.

Yours, sincerely,

SIDNEY M. COLGATE.



COLGATE & Co.,  
New York, January 26, 1918.

We have found that closing our office an hour earlier in the summer has been of much benefit to our employees. They have been able to use the extra hour for recreation and out-of-door work. In speaking to the head of one of our departments, in the fall of the first year that we tried the daylight-saving plan, I said: "George, you have not had a vacation this summer, when do you propose to take it?" He replied: "I do not feel as if I needed a vacation. Every day during the summer was in the nature of a short vacation, and I have never been in better health."

This was the experience of practically all of our office force. We found that all, both men and women, were in better condition; that they worked with much more snap and energy, and that the same force put through more work than before the daylight-saving plan was adopted. Getting out earlier in the afternoon for some recreation or work which really counts, acts as a stimulus and encouragement, and we have found that there was a much more buoyant and cheerful spirit throughout our office force.

We would not under any circumstance go back to the old plan. After we tried this daylight saving for only a month and a half 94 per cent of our employees voted to continue it. Each year we have adopted it for a longer period. During 1917 it was in operation from the 1st of April to the 1st of October, and we certainly will put it into effect this year.

Congress could not take any action which would more easily save fuel, increase the production from the land, and benefit the health of the Nation than by putting into effect the Calder daylight-saving bill which passed the Senate at the last session, but was held up by the House. Almost universally business men are in favor of daylight saving, and if our Congressmen could only realize that their constituents are behind them in this matter there would be no question whatsoever that the bill would promptly be passed.

We are way behind our allies in this respect. They have tried it out and are convinced of the advantages of daylight saving. France has enacted a law that daylight saving, every year, whether they are at war or not, will commence on the 1st of April and continue until the 1st of October.

COLGATE & Co.,  
By SIDNEY M. COLGATE.

Mr. Speaker, to practice what I preach, I yield back the remaining minutes of daylight of my time to the committee.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. OLNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman has stated that similar legislation has been passed in England and several other European countries. Is the time when this change goes into effect uniform?

Mr. OLNEY. It is proposed to conform—

Mr. HASTINGS. Does it go into operation in March or April, or at the same time this bill provides?

Mr. OLNEY. As I understand—

Mr. HASTINGS. Does it go into effect in March or in April? The Senate bill has one date and the House amended it. At what date does this go into effect in European countries?

Mr. SIMS. In England March 24. In Germany, I think, March 15.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then it is not uniform?

Mr. SIMS. Practically uniform.

Mr. HASTINGS. Very nearly so?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] three minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think all of the great industries in the State of Pennsylvania favor this legislation, and there is a reason for it. If work is begun in the mills one hour ahead of the present time of beginning work and it ceases one hour ahead of the present time of ceasing work, there will be an hour's saving, so far as fuel for artificial light and heat are concerned. It has been figured by men who are able to estimate on this subject, as to the \$3,500,000 incandescent lights reported by the Census to be in use in 1915, that it requires to keep those lights going for one hour 6,126 tons of coal. For one hour per day from the end of April until the end of September it requires to keep those lights going 937,000 tons of coal. It is believed that 1,000,000 tons of coal per annum could readily be saved by the passage of this bill.

Gentlemen have suggested that foreign countries have adopted this daylight saving. That is true. In 1906 a parliamentary committee in England reported in favor of daylight saving. That was in a year of peace. The reasons given for it were these: "A greater use of daylight for recreation." That is to say, if work ceased one hour earlier in the day, there would be another hour for recreation, so far as the workers were concerned. The second reason was "less use of houses licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors." That, of course, appealed to the people of England in particular at that time. A third reason was "the benefit to the general health and welfare of all classes." That included the saving of strain on the eyes. When a man works in the daylight the strain on his eyes is not so severe as it is when he works by artificial light. Another

reason given by this parliamentary committee was the reduction of commercial and domestic expenses as to artificial light. That involves the coal-saving estimates I have mentioned for the United States.

Since the war broke out every European country, with the exception of Russia, has found it absolutely necessary to avail itself of these morning hours of daylight which had previously been wasted, because people did not begin work early enough to enable the various industries to avail themselves of the natural light and because there was an extravagance, a waste, and expense, due to the fact that work that could have been done by daylight continued after dark, when lights and fires had to be forced.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the trade and commercial bodies of Pennsylvania and Philadelphia have been sending resolutions urging the passage of this bill as a war measure—a speeding-up measure. Individual business men have also been writing to urge its passage. They want the advantage of that extra daylight hour for reasons that appeal to our business judgment. I shall incorporate several of these in my remarks, but for general information I submit a series of resolutions adopted by the American Philosophical Society, of Philadelphia, founded in the year 1727, which can not be accused of having any other than a scientific interest in this important question. At a meeting in the ancient home of the society in Independence Square, May 31 last, action was taken as follows:

RESOLUTIONS IN REFERENCE TO DAYLIGHT SAVING ADOPTED BY THE  
AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

*Resolved*, That the American Philosophical Society, convened in special meeting for this purpose, memorialize the Congress of the United States urging the early enactment of the identical bills, House No. 2609 and Senate No. 1854, entitled, respectively, "A bill to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States."

*Resolved*, That the members of the American Philosophical Society urge their respective Senators and Representatives to take early and affirmative action on these bills, and that the society address the President, asking his approval of them.

*Resolved*, That the members of the American Philosophical Society urge their respective State legislatures to pass resolutions favoring these bills, as the Pennsylvania Legislature has recently done, and that they further urge commercial, financial, agricultural, and engineering associations in their respective localities to memorialize Congress for the early enactment of these bills.

Mr. Arthur H. Lea, in moving the adoption of the above resolutions, said:

In his autobiography, Benjamin Franklin wrote: "In walking through the Strand and Fleet Street one morning at seven o'clock I observed there was not one shop open, though it had been daylight and the sun up above three hours: the inhabitants of London chusing voluntarily to live much by candle light, and sleep by sunlight, and yet often complain, a little absurdly, of the duty on candles and the high price of tallow." (Digelow edition, Philadelphia, 1868, pp. 291-292.)

The founder of this society was the first to present the idea of daylight saving but his suggestion has been neglected for 150 years. Men can not and will not individually alter their habits of rising and going to bed, but collectively they can do so with no inconvenience. Traveling eastward or westward we alter our watches one hour at certain places and immediately forget the change and adapt ourselves to the new time. By Federal legislation we can do the same and as easily throughout the entire country.

The bills aforesaid would legally establish the standard-time zones adopted by the railroads in 1883, which innovation was then recognized as an immense convenience. They would also cover any legal questions by providing that standard time is to govern common carriers, Government officers, and persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States in their acts and legal relations, rights, and contracts. Furthermore, after establishing standard time, these bills provide for advancing it in the five zones, respectively, by one hour at 2 a. m. on the last Sunday in April of each year, and for retarding it by one hour at 2 a. m. on the last Sunday in September. The only amendment necessary, now that April, 1917, is past, is to provide that for this year the advancement shall take effect at the earliest date, to be specified after approval of the act of Congress.

The advantages of daylight saving are manifold and great. Daylight is free, artificial light costly. According to the United States Census, issued in 1915, there were 83,500,000 incandescent lamps of 50-watt equivalent in the United States in 1912. The growth in the five-year period since 1907 had been at the rate of 84 per cent. Allowing for only a growth of 50 per cent in the five-year period from 1912 to 1917, there are conservatively 130,000,000 such lamps in the United States to-day. To illuminate this number of lamps one hour requires 6,126 tons of coal, according to the best station practice in large units. To illuminate them for one hour per day from the end of April to the end of September requires 937,000 tons of coal. This, then, would be the economy in coal alone by the daylight-saving plan. To this should be added the cost of transporting and delivering this 1,000,000 tons of coal, carting away ashes, etc. It has been impossible to ascertain how many of these lamps are illuminated with hydroelectric current, but it would be conservative to offset them against the oil and gas lamps in the country, and to conclude that the net economy in coal, oil, and gas to be effected by daylight saving would be equivalent to about 1,000,000 tons of coal a year.

From the labor standpoint, if we take eight hours as the standard workday, divided into two equal periods from 8 to 12 o'clock and 1 to 5, with rest and dinner from 12 to 1, there is one hour of daylight more from sunrise to 12 o'clock than from 1 p. m. to sunset, and this disparity increases to 1 hour and 19 minutes at the last Sunday in September.



ber. In other words, from two to three and one-half hours of daylight are now allowed to pass before work begins and only from three-fourths to two and one-half hours of daylight remain after work ends. It would obviously be better if these differences were more nearly equated, or even reversed, so that work would begin in a cooler hour and end sooner after the "heat meridian," when labor is more exhausting. The recreative period of the day would then have more sunlight, and the people would spend more time in fresh air, with resulting physical benefit. Eyestrain would be lessened by the substitution of an additional hour of natural for artificial light. As public health affects public efficiency, the productiveness of the Nation would be increased. Daylight saving, after long discussion during peace, was adopted as a war measure for efficiency and economy by the belligerent nations of Europe, excepting Russia, and the same reasons apply with even greater force to the United States, which does not have as long days and short nights as Europe in summer.

Agricultural productiveness would also be stimulated by the enactment of daylight saving. Farmers would have an extra evening hour of light, and those in other occupations who wish to raise food plants would have the same extra hour after the close of their working day. Thus this change of time would aid immensely in accomplishing the Government's expressed desire for increased food production.

As previously stated, all the belligerent European nations except Russia have adopted daylight saving as a war measure for efficiency and economy, and adjacent neutral nations, such as Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland, have done likewise. These European nations now follow time standards six and seven hours ahead of ours, and therefore their business day is practically over before ours begins. Stock exchanges in London and Paris now close one hour before our exchanges open, and the Continental European stock exchanges close two hours before our opening. Stock-exchange transactions within the same day would be facilitated by our advancing our time, and the same would be true of ordinary commercial and financial transactions across the ocean.

#### THE MANUFACTURING VIEWPOINT.

PHILADELPHIA, March 6, 1918.

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: What is holding up the daylight-saving bill? One million tons of coal could have been saved last summer had Congress passed this bill a year ago, and this quantity of fuel would have kept 1,000,000 families in comfort for a month; it would have prevented thousands of deaths from pneumonia, influenza, and bronchitis; it would have kept factories working which were compelled to close down; it would have kept people employed who have been walking the streets as a result of the fuel famine—all because Congress failed to act.

The only possible objectors to this bill could be the gas and electric light companies, as this bill has the unique distinction of being wholly good—a bill which would lessen suffering, keep the wheels of industry moving, save fuel for our coming winter, promote the health and happiness of millions, and yet it is allowed to remain dormant. I wonder if Congress realizes how much the people are stirred up about this matter? Can't you do something to get prompt action on this bill?

Very truly, yours,

NORTH AMERICAN LACE CO.,  
HENRY S. BROMLEY,  
Vice President.

#### FOR WAR WORK IN THE GARDENS.

NATIONAL WAR GARDEN COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1918.

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for your efforts in behalf of the daylight-saving bill and urge you and your colleagues to redouble efforts now that the planting season is upon us. This bill should increase by fully 25 per cent the efficiency of war gardening this year and add millions of dollars worth of food to that which will be raised f. o. b. the kitchen door. A big drive starts March 18 to get a million boys to aid the farmer. This means that the "city farmer" must get all the help you can give him. War gardens are the field kitchens over here which are supplementing the field kitchens over there. Food must follow the flag. Give the war gardener the extra hour of daylight in which to cultivate his back yard or vacant lot and he will raise food equivalent to the ration of 1,000,000 soldiers for six months.

Yours, very truly,

P. S. RIDSDALE, President.

#### STATEMENT OF A COAL MAN.

PHILADELPHIA, March 14, 1918.

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

House of Representatives Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MOORE: I was very much pleased to read in the paper that you had taken up the advocacy of the daylight-saving bill. As a coal man I can assure you that your estimate that there would be a saving of about 1,000,000 tons of coal is conservative. I know of no one measure which would be more beneficial in the saving of coal than this, and, with a great many other people, can not understand why the House of Representatives is still holding up the measure after it has been passed by the Senate. It should go into effect at least not later than April 1, and as there will be some preliminary arrangements to be made before that time this delay on the part of the House seems incomprehensible.

I hope, now that you are an advocate of the measure, that you can have it passed speedily.

Yours, very cordially,

SAMUEL HEILNER.

AN AUTHOR ON STANDARD TIME.

Kirk Munroe, the author, now residing in Florida, makes this statement as to the complexity of time adjustments:

In 1883 there were 77 different "times" kept by the railroads of the United States. The resulting confusion was so great that a "time convention" of prominent railroad men was called to devise a remedy. They did this by dividing the United States into four time zones—Eastern, Central, Mountain, and Pacific, each covering 15 degrees of longitude (approximately 900 miles) and representing one hour of time. The meridians of longitude bisecting these zones are, respectively, the

seventy-fifth, ninetieth, one hundred and fifth, and one hundred and twentieth. A zone, therefore, covers 7½ degrees of longitude or 450 miles on each side of its bisecting meridian.

Thus the western line of the seventy-fifth meridian zone, dividing eastern from central time, extends due south from Hudson Bay to Habana, Cuba, passing through the cities of Detroit, Mich., Mansfield, Ohio, Ashland, Ky., Bristol, Va., Asheville, N. C., Waycross, Ga., and Tampa, Fla.

This simple zone system was hailed as an excellent solution of the difficulty and was readily adopted by the entire country, though as it did not receive official sanction from the Federal Government there was nothing compulsory about it, except in the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and Florida. In 1915 the last-named State so amended its law on the subject as to make the legal time to be adopted optional with its several counties. Being thus left at liberty to use their own discretion in the matter, the several railroads proceeded to use the time best suited to their own convenience without regarding in the least the desires of the general public, and to change from one time to another at such points as best suited them without regard to the established zone lines. The resulting confusion is almost as bad as that existing before the famous "time convention" was held. Thus the zone line between eastern and central time, instead of being straight and making a readily comprehended division, has become as crooked as a rail fence, and communities west of the time line are keeping eastern time, while others lying far east of it are compelled to keep western time, much to their inconvenience and business disadvantage.

The section of the country suffering most in this respect is the peninsula portion of Florida, which, bordering on the Atlantic and lying almost wholly within the eastern zone, is compelled by its railroads to retard its clocks one hour and keep the time of Texas even as far west as El Paso, Oklahoma, Kansas, etc.

The railroads wholly to blame for this unhappy state of affairs are the Atlantic Coast Line, the Seaboard, the Southern, and the Florida East Coast. The first two run on eastern time as far south as Savannah, and there (80 miles east of the zone line) change to central time for the brief balance of their run into Florida. The Southern, running almost due north and south through Columbia, S. C., changes its time from eastern to central at that point. The Florida East Coast Railway, operated entirely far within the eastern zone, uses central time, though at certain points it is located 150 miles east of the zone line marking the division between eastern and central or western time.

During the present year (1916) all Europe, realizing as never before the value of daylight, has set its clocks ahead a whole hour, and if we Americans would keep up with the economic procession of the world, we must take similar action wherever the railroads are stealing our daylight.

On the eastern coast of Florida both Miami and Key West have in the past adopted eastern time and then been compelled by the Florida East Coast Railway to give it up. Many other Florida communities are loud in their dissatisfaction with western time and are most desirous of adopting eastern time in its place.

Yours, truly,

KIRK MUNROE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HICKS, Mr. BORLAND, and Mr. THOMAS were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ESCH. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, when this proposition was first suggested it came to me with more or less of ridicule. I thought if there was any desire to begin work earlier than was the custom, why not get up earlier and begin it. But in looking into the reasons for the proposal I am persuaded that there is more than sentiment in it. It will not affect the agricultural sections of the country at all, since their rising and retiring are due almost entirely to seasonal conditions. The farmer regards the demands of the seasons rather than customs. The sun rather than the clock is his guide. In the summer time he gets up earlier and begins work earlier than in the winter time. Yet that could not be so in a city where the work is the result of community interest and is done through associations and societies, largely under the law of custom. In centers the population soon learns the demands of the rules of the group. Hours for labor as well as for recreation are fixed by custom. These determine the schedules of trains, the opening and closing of offices, professional and public, the beginning and ending of the business day. The custom of opening the office at 9 o'clock soon assumes the force of law; it would be difficult to change the hour but not to push it ahead by a change of the clock. By the latter method work still begins at 9 by the clock but 8 by the sun. It might end by 4 by the clock but 3 by the sun. We thus change the hour but not the custom.

Earlier rising will give a better product as all must admit who have any experience with the early-morning rising. The mind is brighter and the body more vigorous.

The early closing does not only insure great saving of fuel and light, but it insures a great saving of the afternoon which may be employed in the garden or field for augmenting the food supply. Especially is this true of him who is in indoor work. The open-air work will not only greatly increase the food supply, but it will, by this diversion from indoor to outdoor work prove a great tonic in health to the individual. So I say there is really great value in starting the work an hour earlier in the morning and stopping it an hour earlier in the afternoon, thereby getting more hours for production, thereby losing nothing in the way of time for work, and at the same time saving the time in the afternoon for increase in another line of production that otherwise could not be done if we did not have our earlier hour. This, of course, means little



if anything in the country but much in the city. Therefore, it seems to me that the proposal is laid in genuine good sense, and I shall, although coming from a section where it will not affect us much if at all, vote with pleasure for the saving of the extra hour.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if this earth should disappear from among the 2,000,000 stars in the photographic star catalogue of space, and if upon other planets and stars intelligence in some form is searching the infinite depths which we call the sky, it would simply be noted in some language undreamed of by us that another light had gone out; and with it would disappear the brief history and all material traces of mankind.

We are a small planet revolving around a central sun.

The time we take to make the circuit of the sun we call a year, and the time we take to make one revolution we call a day, and the day we divide into minutes and the minutes into seconds.

By these years, days, minutes, and seconds we measure human transactions and human life, and "the days of our years are three score years and ten; and if by reason of strength, they be four score years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off and we fly away."

We have five senses, all of them inferior to those of the lower animals, and they grow dull with the passing years.

Beyond our normal sight and hearing there are telescopic worlds and microscopic worlds and sound worlds, and in the little radius of our senses on this moving sphere we lay premises from which we try to reason into the unknown.

John Fiske, in his *Excursions of an Evolutionist*, says:

We have every reason to believe that the great glacial period began 240,000 years ago and came to an end 80,000 years ago, but at the beginning of this period men were living in the valley of the Thames. At the end of it, the men of the River drift had probably become extinct and their place in Europe had been taken and held for ages by the boreal cave men who now in turn were about starting on their long retreat to the Arctic regions.

How long a time before the swarthy Iberian settled in Europe with his dogs and cattle we have no means of deciding; nor can we say when the blue-eyed Aryan began his invasions, though we know this last event must have been very recent—not very long before the dawn of history.

Nor can we tell how long there had been human beings on the earth before the glacial epoch began—but it must have been a great while because even before the close of the Pliocene age they had had time to spread over the earth as far as Portugal in one direction and as far as California in the other. And if we are to take the date of 240,000 years ago for the beginning of the glacial epoch we can hardly allow for the close of the Pliocene age an antiquity of less than 400,000 years.

For centuries "they mowed and babbled till some tongue struck speech and patient fingers framed lettered sound."

#### EARLY THEORIES.

Long after the dawn of history primitive man believed that the earth was flat; that the sun, moon, and stars were hung in the heavens for purposes of illumination; that the earthquake and the thunder were the literal voice of an angry God, and that comets were balls of fire flung from heaven at an offending world and brought war and pestilence in their train.

The rotundity of the earth dawned upon the early Greek astronomers. Pythagoras (500—470 B. C.) "deduced his system in which the earth revolves in an orbit from fantastic first principles," one of which was that "the circular motion is the most perfect motion."

Plato (born 429 B. C.) proposed to astronomers "the problem of representing the courses of the planets by circular motions."

Aristotle (384—322 B. C.) "summed up the state of astronomical knowledge in his time and held the earth to be fixed in the center of the world."

Eratosthenes (276—196 B. C.) "measured an arc of meridian from Alexandria to Syene (Assuan) and found the difference of latitude by the length of a shadow at noon, summer solstice."

Ptolemy (130 A. D.) "theorized on the planetary motions and held that the earth is fixed in the center of the universe."

The Greek astronomers who believed the earth to be at rest reasoned that if it were revolving things would fly off from it.

But with the decay of ancient civilization the world forgot the learning of the Greeks.

As time went on a system of the universe comprehending heaven and earth and hell, created out of myth, mystery, legend, and story, took shape in human thought and became real.

It culminated in the sixth century in a complete edifice of the universe constructed by the Egyptian monk, Cosmas, in which heaven was above, the earth the ground floor, and hell below.

When Dante wrote his *Divine Comedy* early in the fourteenth century he wrote it in the light of the astronomic and theologic knowledge of his time.

In the view of medieval Europe the earth was flat, bounded on the north by ice and Arctic blasts too cold for life to live in; on the south by desert wastes and boiling seas too hot for life to live in; on the east by far Cathay and swamps of vast extent, and on the west by a "Sea of Darkness"; and the few people who finally began to talk about a possible other side of the world where trees grew downward and rain fell upward were considered by knight, monk, and vassal as mere babblers and dreamers of dreams.

The science of those days was mixed with miracle and prodigy. "It brewed strange ingredients into elixirs of life, searched for the philosopher's stone, and gathered herbs in auspicious phases of the moon for the cure of diseases."

The map of Claudius Ptolemy made in the middle of the second century, and the travels of Marco Polo in Asia represented all that scholars knew and much of what they conjectured concerning the earth's surface down to the voyages of the fifteenth century; but during all that time the theory of the monk, Cosmas, that the earth was flat and stationary was commonly accepted.

For centuries Europe, looking westward across the sea, spoke of it as the "Sea of Darkness" and beyond its mysterious horizon few mariners dared to sail.

By the thirteenth century, however, it had become known that beyond Cathay—that is, Cipango, or Japan—the earth did not extend itself in swamps, but that the shores of eastern Asia were bounded by a sea as were the shores of eastern Europe.

The mariner's compass, discovered in the twelfth century and rejected for nearly a hundred years because it was believed to be the work of the devil, had by the end of the thirteenth century come into general use, and here and there cloistered scholars and student navigators began to wonder if the sea that washed the shores of western Europe was not the same sea that washed the shores of eastern Asia, and whether it was not possible to sail westward into the east.

Generations "bloomed out, loved and hated, and rustled off, and the rolling and tramping of new generations passed over them."

The earth was torn by wars of spoliation, conquest, and religion; Europe fought back the Moors and Moslems and organized the crusades.

A little later men began to kill one another with gunpowder, and thereafter brute strength had no monopoly.

A little later they learned to print their thoughts on paper, with movable blocks and a printing press, and thereafter there was no monopoly of knowledge by a few.

A little later a man was born near Genoa destined to demonstrate that the "Sea of Darkness" had another shore and to lift the veil from a continent where in the course of time there should be founded under God a nation—"consecrated to liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

#### COPERNICUS, BRAHE, KEPLER, GALILEO, AND NEWTON.

Man knows now that the earth is round, because he lives around it, has traveled around it, strung cable and telegraph systems around it, and talks around it constantly by wire and by wireless.

But the rotundity of the earth and its habitation on opposite sides, which are now accepted "always everywhere and by all," was for centuries a subject of learned disputation and theological controversy in which the scriptures were constantly invoked against the theory of the Antipodes and punishment was inflicted here and salvation was denied hereafter to those who dared dispute the theological argument.

Nicholas Copernicus, an ecclesiastic born in 1472, investigating the theory of Ptolemy, that the earth was the fixed center of the universe, which had held sway then for 1,000 years, came to the scientific conclusion that not only the earth but all the then known planets revolved around the sun and established the rotation of the earth upon its axis.

This was opposed to the evidence of the senses. For ages it had been argued that if the earth were in motion a wind of great velocity would surround the earth, that bodies thrown upward from the earth would remain behind and that it was clear that if a bird flew up from its nest, it could never return.

Copernicus argued that there could be no such wind as it was believed would result from the earth's rotation, because the air would share the motion of the earth.

He wrote a book called "The Revolution of the Heavenly Bodies," but for 36 years it remained unpublished, because he foresaw the storm its publication would provoke, and feared the

consequences to himself. The only copy he ever saw was brought to him on his death bed in 1543.

Three years after the death of Copernicus came Tycho Brahe, whose collection of observations through long years of study of the heavens helped to lay the foundations for the work of Johannes Kepler, said to be the "real founder of modern astronomy."

Contemporary with Kepler was Galileo, born in 1564. He discovered and demonstrated certain laws of motion; one that "the motion of a body will never stop nor vary its speed nor change its direction except by the action of some force"; another that "a light body and a heavy body fall at the same speed, except for the resistance of air"; another, the isochronism of the vibrations of a pendulum, that is "that a pendulum of a given length, has its time of swing independent of the extent of swing."

This pendulum principle in the hands of Huyghens in the middle of the seventeenth century led to the invention of the pendulum clock.

In 1607 Galileo heard that a Dutch spectacle maker had combined a pair of lenses so as to magnify distant objects, and from this suggestion, without having seen this combination of lenses, he evolved a telescope, one of the first turned toward the sky.

His telescope and his heliocentric theory got him into serious trouble, but men with telescopes still continued to scan the sky.

He died on Christmas Day, 1642, and on that same day Sir Isaac Newton, who worked out the law of universal gravitation, was born.

When Newton gave his discovery to the world it was objected that he had substituted gravitation for Providence.

When the work of these men was finished the old conception of the universe was gone, and the question of whether the earth stands still passed forever beyond the stage of controversy to final judgment.

Old religious controversies became "volcanoes burnt out, on the lava and ashes and scoria of which the olive and vine are now growing."

#### TIME.

Time is a mystery. The time of the earth's rotation or of its circuit round the sun is long or short, as we live it. It may be a too brief happiness or a lingering torture. Some grow old before they have time to be young.

In the "Confessions" of St. Augustine he says:

What, then, is time? If no one asks me, I know. If I try to explain it to one who asks, I do not know. Yet I say with confidence that I know. But if nothing passes away, there would be no past time. If nothing were to come, there would be no future time. If nothing were, there would be no present time.

Yet these two times, past and future, how can they be when the past is not now and the future is not yet?

As for the present, if it were always present and did not pass over into the past, it would not be time but eternity.

Past time is not now, future time is not yet, and present time has no duration.

In the universe of eternity there is no rising and setting of suns, no day, no night, no years, no centuries. Sun time is merely local time in its relation to eternity.

Human chronology belongs to this solar system alone and we measure time while the sun shines and throws shadows against a background which we call history.

Conquerors and kings, lawgivers, saints, jesters, scoundrels, geniuses, and charlatans, millionaires, and mendicants have come and gone their way in pomp or squalor, out of mystery into mystery, and the sun and the wise, experienced stars look down and give no hint of human destination.

"No philosophy will ever satisfy men which can not throw a plank across the grave."

We are still baffled by the illusive illumination that some call individuality and others call soul.

All our philosophy, all our groping speculation and reasoning leave the mystery of the future as mysterious as ever and yet as imperative as ever.

Bacon says:

If a man meditate much upon the universal frame of nature, the earth with men upon it—the divineness of the soul excepted—will not seem much other than an ant hill where some ants carry corn and some carry their young and all go to and fro, a little heap of dust.

If the hope of continued conscious existence after the death of the body ever fades out of human thinking, then the light will have gone out of the world; the deepest inspiration to right living will have ended and human existence will have become a meaningless tragedy.

That hope transforms Bacon's ant heap and dignifies human existence. With that hope we journey on to superlative issues.

We may put back the clock or set it ahead or stop it altogether, but time goes on and present time has no duration.

#### LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE.

The question of "daylight saving," of setting the clock ahead, is not new. It is said that Benjamin Franklin originated the idea, but in 1907 an Englishman named William Willett published a pamphlet on "Waste of Daylight," and since 1916 all the nations of Europe except Russia, Greece, and the Balkan countries have adopted the plan.

The stars enter but little into the consideration of the average man going about his business. They were there when he arrived a short time ago, and they will be there when he goes a short time hence.

The question of whether they were put there by a Supervising Intelligence or were sown in space by chance gives him little concern.

He goes about his business till the undertaker calls, and then his surviving associates trot the horses to the cemetery and hurry back to their business and their little plans for permanence.

He looks upon the "star gazer" as a dreamer disconnected from practical affairs, and yet the map on his office wall, with its lines of latitude and longitude, is the result of centuries of study of the sky.

If he wants to travel by water, he does not speculate on how ships find their way across the sea. He simply finds out the sailing time, engages a room, and goes aboard.

On his voyage he sees a paper posted up from day to day telling where the ship is, and he knows in a general way that the captain or somebody takes observations of the sun at noon, but he does not trouble himself about how it is all done.

To guide a ship swiftly, surely, and safely across the ocean and alongside the wharf of the port of destination is one of the triumphs of human knowledge, and it is only within comparatively recent times that it has been possible.

The transition from sails to steam was only a little while ago. It was not until 1815 that steamboats began to feel their way along the rivers and along the coasts.

The navigator "takes the sun" at noon by a sextant, and the dictionaries define a sextant as "an instrument for measuring the angular distance between two objects—as between a heavenly body and the horizon—by a double reflection from two mirrors, used especially for determining latitude at sea by taking the sun's altitude at noon."

The navigator begins to watch the sun through the sextant near midday and continues till the instant it begins to descend. That is the instant of noon on the ship.

He then compares the height of the sun at noon with certain astronomical tables in his chart room and knows in what latitude the sun reaches that precise height on that particular day in the year.

When he gets his longitude he knows exactly where his ship is, and he gets this by a chronometer.

A marine chronometer is defined as "an accurate time-keeper used for determining a ship's longitude at sea. It is suspended horizontally in gimbals and beats half seconds."

Early unsuccessful efforts were made to so adjust a pendulum clock that it would not be affected by the rolling of a ship at sea, and in 1713, by an act of the English Parliament, upon the recommendation of a committee of which Sir Isaac Newton was chairman, a reward was offered, £20,000, for an instrument that would find the longitude at sea true to half a degree.

John Harrison, of Yorkshire, won the reward after 43 years of study and experiment, but did not receive his final payment until 1764.

A navigator's chronometer is ordinarily set to Greenwich time. The meridian line passing through Greenwich, England, where the British Royal Observatory was established in 1675, is by common consent used as the line from which time and distance, east and west, are reckoned.

For purposes of convenient computation 360 lines of longitude are commonly drawn from pole to pole and, starting from the Greenwich line, are numbered east and west around the world, the line opposite Greenwich, on the other side of the world, of course, being the one hundred and eightieth degree.

Inasmuch as the earth revolves from west to east, and inasmuch as it turns through 360 degrees of longitude in 24 hours, it turns at the rate of 15 degrees an hour. Therefore the time at a point 180 degrees east and west from Greenwich would at the same time be 12 hours later than Greenwich and 12 hours earlier than Greenwich.

For illustration, Samoa and the Fiji Islands are geographically neighbors, but Samoa is nearly 180 degrees west of Greenwich and the Fiji Islands are nearly 180 degrees east of Greenwich, so that when it is Sunday in Samoa it is Monday in the Fiji Islands.



To obviate this difficulty an arbitrary line has been drawn upon the map of the world down through the Pacific near the one hundred and eightieth meridian line, and it has been informally agreed that islands on the east side of this line shall reckon their longitude west from Greenwich and islands on the west side shall reckon their longitude east from Greenwich. This line is known as the International Date Line.

To get the longitude of a ship at sea the navigator, having found the ship's time, compares it with Greenwich time, and if he is sailing east of Greenwich, he knows that the ship's time is earlier than Greenwich time, because the sun is over points east first, and if he is sailing west of Greenwich he knows that the ship's time is later than Greenwich time.

For illustration, if it is noon on a ship in the Atlantic and the chronometer shows that it is 1 o'clock at Greenwich the navigator knows that his ship is 15° west of Greenwich, since 15° of longitude equal one hour of time.

#### SETTING A WATCH.

We get our standards of time from the study of the stars. To the man on the street the setting of his watch is a trifling thing, but to set a watch or a clock involves the use of the most delicate machinery of this mechanical age, machinery which derives its accuracy from the stars in their courses.

Obelisks, sundials, and water clocks were used to measure time before the Byzantines learned the art of glass blowing, and after that sand glasses were used on land and sea.

To know the speed of a ship in the early days of navigation a piece of wood, called "the log," shaped to resist being dragged through the water was tied to the end of a cord with knots on it, spaced with arithmetical precision, and as the cord slid through the sailor's fingers the time between knots was measured by the sand glass, and these words "knot" and "log" still survive in the language of the sea.

Now, if your watch runs down you set it by the nearest watch or clock. If you want to be accurate, you set it by a jeweler's "regulator." But the "regulator" varies a little from day to day so that the sum of its variations in a week may be appreciable and the "regulator" must in turn be regulated by the astronomical clock.

Every observatory has an astronomical clock which is made as perfect as human skill can make it.

It must be mounted upon a firm foundation, subject as little as possible to vibration, change of temperature, and barometric pressure.

But when made as perfect as possible, it has to be set and regulated by observation of the stars.

For these observations a transit is necessary. The transit is a telescope, the tube of which is firmly attached at right angles to a horizontal axis the ends of which point east and west, so that the telescope may be so rotated as to follow a line along the sky from north to south known as the astronomical meridian.

Across the field of view of the telescope fine threads are mounted so as to form a minute cross.

From astronomical observations for a hundred and fifty years astronomers have compiled tables by which they know exactly when each tabulated star is on the astronomical meridian line.

To know, then, whether the astronomical clock is right it is necessary to check a star by the cross in the telescope at the exact instant it crosses the astronomical meridian line.

If the clock time of crossing tallies with the star time of crossing, the clock is right. If not, it is set accordingly.

This star time regulates earth time. Exactly at noon every day time is ticked by telegraph all over the country.

#### STANDARD TIME.

There is another kind of time called "standard" or railroad time, which was put in operation in the United States by the railroads in 1883, and has since been generally adopted throughout the world.

Since the sun apparently travels from east to west it is obvious that local time differs widely throughout the country.

For illustration, before standard time was adopted trains leaving New York on New York time arrived in Buffalo by New York time, which was different from Buffalo time; left Buffalo by Buffalo time and arrived in Chicago by Buffalo time, which was different from Chicago time, and so on across the continent.

Railroad companies had the custom of running their trains by the time of the chief town along a given line, so that when several different lines entered a town the town had several different kinds of time.

By the "standard" time system the whole country, including Alaska, is divided into five time zones 15 degrees wide east and west, so arranged that the middle meridian lines of the zones from east to west are, respectively, 75, 90, 105, and 120 degrees west from Greenwich, and that of Alaska is 150 degrees west

from Greenwich. The time of each meridian line is the time of the whole zone.

The time at each of these meridian lines and of the zone it governs is therefore earlier than Greenwich time by even hours. For illustration, since 15 degrees make an hour, the 75-degree line is 5 hours earlier than Greenwich, the 90-degree line 6 hours, and so on across the continent.

This bill, with amendments recommended by the committee, proposes by law to standardize the time of the United States and to advance the present "railroad time" one hour during a period of seven months in each year, beginning at 2 o'clock a. m. on the last Sunday in March, and ending at 2 o'clock a. m. on the last Sunday in October.

But whether we call it sun time, star time, or standard time, it is only man's method of trying to measure the flight of the future which is not yet through the portals of the present, which has no duration.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. At the conclusion of one hour, is it in order for another Member to ask for recognition to speak on the bill?

The SPEAKER. It is not. The House ordered the hour extended by 20 minutes and at the end the previous question considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Mr. LONDON. There was such a request, Mr. Speaker, but I was not aware that the House had agreed to it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that it was objected to. If the gentleman gets the floor he is entitled to an hour.

Mr. LONDON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. If I ask to be recognized and I get one hour, can I speak five minutes and then yield the rest of the time?

The SPEAKER. Yes; but the gentleman has not yet got his hour. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] has made it necessary for me to refer to the little personal matter mentioned by him that, unexplained, might cause you to think that I am getting old. The gentleman wanted to know why we did not move the clock forward two hours instead of one? We can, but it is not needed. The gentleman from Arkansas when he came to be sworn in as a Member lacked two hours of being 25 years old; he lacked two hours of the constitutional age. We moved the clock ahead two hours in order that he might be sworn in. That is why we happen to have him here to-day. [Laughter.] So you see that when it is necessary to fool ourselves, that the hands of the clock be set forward, we can do so.

Now, outside of this little pleasantry, I want to say that the Senate bill provided that the clock should be advanced one hour on the last Sunday in April and retarded one hour on the last Sunday in September. The House amended the bill so as to provide that the clock should be set forward one hour on the last Sunday in March and retarded one hour on the last Sunday in October, so as to make the time included seven months instead of five. The reason was that more coal is consumed in March and October than in any two months included in the Senate bill. The fuel situation was such that there was an appeal to make the bill applicable to 7 months out of the 12 months.

That is how these amendments came to be made. It is impossible in a few minutes to reply to all the arguments and objections that have been made to the bill, but gentlemen from the country ought to know that the country people, the farmers, will get up no sooner and go to bed no later. The trouble with the country farmer is that when he goes to town where such gentlemen as my friend from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] live, he has to wait for these luxurious gentlemen to get up before he can sell them his eggs and butter and vegetables so he can go back to his farm. This will force these gentlemen to get up an hour sooner. The farmer will get into town and sell his barter and buy the things he needs and get back and get to work an hour earlier in the morning. It is on account of the farmer that I am in favor of this bill and not these luxurious lawyers who do not want to go to bed until 2 o'clock in the morning and not get up before 10 o'clock in the day. Another thing we want is that the saloons and other kind of houses that keep late hours close, at least on Saturday night, one hour sooner—

Mr. KING. And open one hour earlier in the morning.

Mr. SIMS. No, indeed; the morning following Saturday is Sunday morning. And this they will have to do, because this will make the law as to closing apply with penalty attached. But my friend from Arkansas need not observe this law, because he will not have to suffer from any penalty for the violation of

it, as he is in no business required to close any earlier. He was so young when he came here that naturally his mind is yet a little slower as to legislative matters than if he had been of constitutional age when he reached this body.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. WINGO. When I lived in Tennessee I found that the farmers did not waste any time on a man who was too lazy to set his alarm clock to get up an hour earlier. I do not think they have enough energy to buy a clock.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman must know that the people everywhere else are not as industrious as in the district I represent and where he once lived. The farmers of my district need no alarm clocks to wake them in the morning. A request for the passage of this bill has come from the President of the United States, from the Secretary of the Treasury, from the Food Administration, from the Fuel Administration, and Ambassador Sharp, in France, sent a cablegram to explain how important it is, and that has been transmitted to me by the Secretary of State, and I am going to ask unanimous consent to place in the Record a few of the letters, resolutions, and communications in favor of this bill. The United States Chamber of Commerce and a great number of industrial organizations over the whole country favor this bill, and no one that I know of is opposed to the bill except Members of the House, who do not seem to know what the sentiment of the country is regarding this measure and without having given the bill any real study treat it as a trivial and unimportant matter:

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILROADS,  
Washington, January 18, 1918.

Hon. T. W. SIMS,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Note the attached from Mr. Marks. I think this is a very important matter. If you think it could be put through on the railroad bill without delaying it or causing controversy, I am willing. On the other hand, I think this daylight-saving bill is of sufficient importance to justify a special rule so as to insure its immediate consideration in the House. The latter I would strongly urge.

Cordially, yours,

W. G. McADOO.

JANUARY 18, 1918.

Hon. W. G. McADOO,  
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am just in receipt of your letter of the 18th inclosing a letter from Hon. Marcus M. Marks, with reference to the daylight-saving bill. I have just written Mr. Marks a letter in reply to one he has written me suggesting that the daylight-saving bill be attached as an amendment to the railroad legislation. I have repeatedly assured Mr. Marks that the daylight-saving bill was going to be considered by the committee and acted on at an early date; that the same has been made a part of the war legislation; that it is to have preferential consideration, but that I did not think it wise or prudent to attempt to amend the railroad bill by attaching it to that bill. If we open the door for amendments of this kind nobody knows where it will end. I do not think that if there is any objection to the consideration of the daylight-saving bill when reported to the House that there would be a particle of trouble in getting a rule to have it considered on its merits. I have been strongly in favor of the bill ever since it was introduced, and did all I possibly could to get Judge ADAMSON to agree to act on it last session, as the President well knows as we had quite a lengthy correspondence concerning it. One or more bills besides this one are being urged as proper amendments to the railroad bill. My own judgment is that we should have just as little legislation or legislative provisions in the railroad bill as is possible to have, and that these provisions should apply exclusively to the operation of railroads while they are in your hands.

This is the way this matter strikes me, and as it is not at all necessary to attach the daylight-saving bill to the railroad bill in order to secure its consideration and passage, I can not think it wise to attempt it.

Very sincerely, yours,

T. W. SIMS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, February 12, 1918.

Hon. THETUS W. SIMS,  
Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith for your committee's information in connection with bills on the subject now before it a copy of a telegram from the American ambassador at Paris, wherein he states that the daylight-saving regulations which have been in operation in France for two successive seasons have demonstrated the wisdom of the plan, and expresses the hope that there will be no opposition in Congress to the enactment of a similar law in the United States.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

ROBERT LANSING.

PARIS, February 8, 1918.

SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington:

Noticing in the American press the legislation providing for daylight saving during the summer months is now pending, may I express the hope that there will be no opposition to such a measure. The wisdom of this regulation in France has been amply demonstrated through its operation for two successive seasons. I believe it is one of a number of common-sense and practicable economies brought out by the exigencies of the war which should remain permanently as a part of our national economic life.

SHARP.

UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1918.

Hon. THETUS W. SIMS,  
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SIMS: I hardly think that it will become necessary to secure any additional support on the general principle involved in the bill for daylight saving. However, I am only too pleased to give my indorsement to the effectiveness of similar legislation as carried out in Europe. There is no doubt that in the coming spring and summer the additional food production which the Government is desirous of securing will be very largely stimulated by the additional period of daylight which would be given to those town workers who interest themselves in gardening and whose production is of very real importance at this time. I wish you every success in your efforts to carry this excellent bill, which has already been passed by the Senate, through the House.

Faithfully, yours,

HERBERT HOOVER.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,  
EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION,  
Washington, December 29, 1917.

Hon. THETUS W. SIMS,  
Chairman Committee on Interstate and  
Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing a memorandum, the substance of which was contained in the letter I sent to the President a short time ago. I understand this bill is to come before your committee for a hearing very shortly. Also that you strongly favor the bill. I am in hopes that the hearing will make it possible for a speedy acceptance by Congress of this measure.

If there is anything that we can do to further the bill I should be glad to know.

Very truly, yours,

EDWARD N. HURLEY, President.

The daylight-saving movement has proven a success in 12 of the largest countries of Europe, in that it has resulted in material economies in the use of coal and artificial light and in its benefits to the workers of the nation.

The Senate recently passed a similar daylight-saving act for this country, and the measure is to come before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the next session of Congress.

The daylight-saving plan, if put into operation in this country for the period of April 1 to October 1, would not only result in economies for our people but would materially help the shipbuilder. Practically all "outside" work on ships is dependent upon daylight. Under our present system of time workers begin their work usually at 7 o'clock in the morning and leave at 5 o'clock. This means a loss of an hour of daylight during certain months of the year. Under the daylight-saving system this hour would be gained and more work produced, for in effect the hours of work would be 6 a. m. to 4 p. m.

The result would be increased productivity, less danger from accident, and economy. If the President could urge upon Congress to consider the daylight-saving measure in view of the experience of Europe and our own necessities the shipbuilders and workers of the country would be grateful.

IN THE SENATE, May 16, 1917.

Whereas enemy Governments have passed laws advancing the time one hour during the long summer days for the purpose of conserving their resources and other belligerents have done likewise as a measure of economic war necessity: Therefore

Resolved (if the House concur). That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania indorses the efforts of the business interests now being made to secure the passage by the Congress of the United States of legislation known as daylight saving to advance the standard time one hour during the summer months.

Resolved further. That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Pennsylvania.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Legislature of Pennsylvania on May 16, 1917.

(Signed) W. P. GALLAGHER,  
Chief Clerk, Senate of Pennsylvania.

Resolutions adopted by Norfolk-Tidewater Association of Credit Men. Whereas a demand has been made to advance the time throughout the country one hour from the last day of April to the last day of September: and

Whereas it has been shown that many European countries which adopted the plan as a war measure have derived such benefits in the conservation and economy of gas, electricity, coal, and oil that it may become a permanent law with them; and

Whereas it is estimated that the extra hour of daylight will add production in all lines and save approximately \$50,000,000 in lighting bills and 1,000,000 tons of fuel during that period as well as improve the health of the Nation: Be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the Norfolk-Tidewater Association of Credit Men go on record as favoring national legislation to carry out this plan.

THE MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,  
New York, February 2, 1918.

Hon. THETUS W. SIMS,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish again to urge upon you favorable action by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce upon Senate bill 1854, to save daylight, which bill, as you doubtless are aware, passed the Senate June 27, 1917.

The arguments in favor of this measure are convincingly stated in Senate report 46, and we understand that the bill has the support of the President.

On account of the present coal situation and the possibility of saving coal through the curtailment of light during working hours, it is particularly desirable that the bill become law at the earliest possible



moment. The purpose of the bill is strongly approved by the general sentiment of the country and particularly by business and manufacturing interests, and we hope that you will lend your influence to promote its speedy passage.

Yours, very truly,

THE MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,  
By S. C. MEAD, Secretary.

UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1918.

Hon. T. W. SIMS,  
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SIMS: I understand that the so-called daylight saving bill will be up for discussion in your committee at an early date. The experience of England and France has convinced me that the change of time provided in this bill would save the United States a very large amount of fuel in the course of a year. I believe that an estimate of 800,000 to 1,000,000 tons direct saving in coal would not be excessive.

As Fuel Administrator I should be much gratified by such favorable action on the part of your committee as would place this bill on the statute books in time to make the saving effective this year.

Very truly, yours,

H. A. GARFIELD,  
Fuel Administrator.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1918.

Hon. THETUS W. SIMS,  
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE SIMS: As you may be interested in the period during which England will utilize daylight saving this year, we inclose, on behalf of Mr. A. Lincoln Filene, chairman of our committee on daylight saving, an excerpt from a short discussion which occurred in the House of Commons on January 17, 1918.

Very truly, yours,

ELLIOT H. GOODWIN, Secretary.

#### "SUMMER TIME."

[Oral answers, Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Jan. 17, 1918, p. 478.]

25. Mr. Gilbert asked the home secretary if it is the intention of the Government to put into force summer time during the present year; and if so, in view of the early date of the Easter holidays this year, will he consider whether the alteration can be made from March 25 and also continued until the first week in October, so that the country can have this benefit as long as possible?

Sir G. CAYE. The experience of the second year of summer time has confirmed the conclusions based on the first year's working of the scheme, and I think it will be in accordance with the general wish that summer time should be continued. As regards the period during which it shall be put in force, the honorable member will recollect that the question was investigated after the first year by a departmental committee, which recommended the period from the second Sunday in April to the third Sunday in September. This recommendation was adopted by the Government last year. No decision has yet been taken as regards this year, and I can only say that the question of period will be carefully considered before the order is made.

PERIODICAL PUBLISHERS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
New York, January 29, 1918.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am pleased to inform you that at the last meeting of the Periodical Publishers' Association, held on January 23, the following resolutions were adopted in reference to the Calder daylight-saving bill:

"Whereas 12 European countries, including England, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Portugal, Holland, Russia, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, have adopted daylight saving as a war-economy measure with satisfactory results; and

"Whereas the present coal situation accentuates the advantage of a saving of 1,000,000 tons of coal which would be one of the annual results of the adoption of this measure; and

"Whereas the saving in lighting bills, stimulation of farm gardening and of healthful daylight sports, the substitution of an hour's labor in the cool morning in place of the hot afternoon, and furthermore, uniformity of our time with Europe's, are all economies and advantages which will follow the adoption of the daylight-saving bill: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the Periodical Publishers' Association of America, indorse the movement of the National Daylight Saving Association to turn the clocks of this country forward one hour on the last Sunday of April and back again on the last Sunday in September.

"Resolved, That we urge Congress to adopt as a war-emergency measure the Calder daylight-saving bill, already unanimously passed by the United States Senate, where it was introduced in conformity with the request of the National Daylight Saving Association."

Very truly, yours,

JOHN ADAMS THAYER,  
Executive Secretary.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1918.

Hon. THETUS W. SIMS,  
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE SIMS: In order that you may have before you the position of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in advocacy of legislation which will establish daylight saving, I beg to submit a memorandum in which we have attempted to place in somewhat summary form our reasons for hoping that legislation will be enacted without delay

Prof. Robert W. Willson, of Harvard University, has prepared rather elaborate statistical data, which will indicate by hour and minute the results of daylight saving in each important community of the country. This data has been sent to the printer, and copies will be forwarded to you in the very near future.

Very truly, yours,

A. LINCOLN FILENE,  
Chairman Executive Committee on Daylight Saving  
of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

#### DAYLIGHT SAYING—ITS ADVANTAGES—USE AS A WAR MEASURE—FUEL CONSERVATION—REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION.

[Statement presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives by the Executive Committee on Daylight Saving of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.]

##### I. Advantages of daylight saving.

###### A. MILITARY.

1. The training of the national forces will be expedited, and the practice of Home Guards and similar organizations, the members of which have other regular occupations, will be greatly facilitated.
2. Production would be increased in the shipyards of the country.
3. The production in all plants which are making materials for military use and for building ships would be increased, and the conditions of work for their employees would be improved.

###### B. ECONOMY.

1. There will be the greatest of all savings—that of human materials—as pointed out below.
2. Immediate saving in form of reduction of expense for light and heat.
3. Ultimate saving in the conservation of coal and other sources of light and heat.
4. Possible reduction in the cost of living of those who like to work in their gardens, utilizing the extra outdoor hour for this purpose.

###### C. HEALTH, MORALS, AND SOCIAL WELFARE.

1. One hour more for outdoor recreation. Recreation is a national asset, an immense force for health and moral well-being.
2. Working mothers and fathers obtain an extra hour for outdoor play with their children, both summer and winter.
3. One hour less for bad lights in tenements.
4. Lessened eyestrain for workers and school children due to the use of artificial light.
5. Smaller risk of accident in industrial establishments because there will be a light hour instead of a dark one at the end of the working day at the time of greatest fatigue and most frequent accidents.
6. Lessened risk of accident due to transportation and traffic conditions, because the afternoon rush will fall in daylight instead of darkness.
7. Working girls will be on the way home in daylight instead of in the dark in winter.
8. Our last hour of sleep will be sounder and more beneficial than it is under present conditions, because there will be less light.

###### D. EFFICIENCY.

1. General efficiency will, of course, be increased by any improvement in the health, morals, and social welfare of the workers and others.
2. In summer a cool hour in the morning is substituted for a hot one in the afternoon.
3. In winter a light hour at the end of the day is substituted for a dark one. This is especially valuable coming as it does at the time of greatest fatigue and is peculiarly valuable in some industries where accurate eyesight is essential.
4. Efficiency is lowest in the later afternoon, the time when accidents are most frequent.

##### II. The daylight-saving plan as a war measure.

1. The daylight-saving plan was adopted as a war measure by Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Austria, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Portugal, Australia, Iceland.

The year 1916 was the first year of operation of the plan in all but the last two countries, which adopted the plan in 1917.

A committee of the British House of Commons, which made a preliminary study of the question in 1908 and 1909, reported favorably a daylight-saving bill, stating the results would be:

- "To promote the greater use of daylight for recreative purposes.
- "To lessen the use of houses licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors.
- "To facilitate the training of the territorial force.
- "To benefit the physique, general health, and welfare of all classes of the community.
- "To reduce the industrial, commercial, and domestic expenditure on artificial light.
- "That the object of the bill, which is desirable and would benefit the community, can not be attained without legislation.
- "And that an alteration of the clock of one hour in April and a similar alteration of one hour in September is the best mode of attaining the object of the bill."

##### Reasons why daylight saving was adopted as a war measure.

###### A. Economy in consumption of coal, oil, gas, light, etc.

###### ENGLAND.

1. The savings in the use of artificial light and fuel to produce this in England were estimated as \$2,500,000 for the summer months alone. (Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, vol. 82, No. 39, p. 304.)

2. Mr. Hanbury Thomas, of the Sheffield United Gas Co., has suggested that a general estimate for the whole country can be arrived at from the figures of actual saving in coal given in the replies from those undertakings who use coal and no other fuel on the following plan: The amount of coal stated by such undertakings (28 in number) to have been saved as a direct result of summer time works out in the aggregate at 1,449 per cent of the total annual quantity carbonized by them. The total quantity of coal used by all gas undertakings in the United Kingdom in 1915 was, in round figures, 18,000,000 tons. Reckoning 1,449 per cent of those figures, therefore, the saving in coal affected by gas undertakings in the United Kingdom as a result of the four and a half months of summer time may be put at about 260,000 tons.

Further, applying the same percentage to the total annual sum spent by consumers on gas (reckoned on the total annual sales of gas undertakings at 3s. per 1,000 cubic feet) the saving in expenditures to consumers works out at about £475,000.

These estimates can not, of course, be regarded as anything but conjectural; but they represent the best that can be done with the figures, and are not perhaps very far wide of the mark. (Report, Summer Time Committee, England, Feb. 1917, p. 12.)

3. The parliamentary committee heard from over 80 municipal electrical light undertakings, from 50 to 60 private companies, and from 11 electric power companies.

The estimates of the reduction in consumption of electric light vary very widely, from 1.25 per cent in one case to 55 per cent.

The returns of the power companies give a mean reduction of 20 per cent for lighting purposes.

Thirty-eight private companies furnished figures giving an estimate of reduction varying from 10 to 41 per cent, the mean for the 38 being 23 per cent.

Sixty-four municipal undertakings give a mean reduction of 18.3 per cent in units used for lighting. (Report Summer Time Committee, England, Feb. 1917, p. 10.)

4. According to E. Houghton Fry, secretary committee for regulation of petroleum supplies, the economy affected by the daylight-saving act in consumption of illuminating oils in England was 2½ per cent of the consumption for the year, i. e., about 11,500 tons.

"This seems to be a very modest proportion, but it should be remembered that 11,500 tons represents two journeys by an oil tanker, which would occupy approximately four months, and this saving, therefore, can by no means be regarded as negligible. In fact, owing to the shortage that is at present being experienced in these vessels the result is a very welcome one."

5. Mr. Herbert Samuel, in the House of Commons, May 8, 1916, said:

"The Government would not have dreamt of favoring this measure or of inviting the House to consider it unless it had reason to think that it was essentially advantageous for war purposes."

"The question of our coal supply is one which is giving us serious concern."

"We are casting about in every direction for means to increase our coal supplies, and when a proposal is made which, we believe, and indeed are convinced, would lead to a large economy of certainly many hundreds of thousands of tons of coal in the course of a year, we can not regard that as a matter of indifference."

6. The question was first brought to notice by the expert committee appointed to advise the Government on the disposal of the coal output.

This central committee for the disposal of coal unanimously passed a resolution urging the Government to adopt the daylight-saving plan in order to conserve the coal resources of the nation.

7. The board of trade found it necessary to urge upon all gas and electric light companies a reduction in their consumption of coal.

8. The railway executive committee managing the railways on behalf of the Government favored the proposal.

(Parliamentary debates, House of Commons, May 8, 1916, p. 345.)

#### FRANCE.

[From summary, report of M. Mallavalle (depute), on behalf Commission de l'Enseignement et des Beaux Arts, on bill for renewal of summer time in 1917 and subsequent years.]

1. The committee record two sets of estimates of the total saving in coal for the whole country as follows:

(1) The total quantity of coal consumed by gas undertakings in France annually being put at 5,000,000 tons and by electrical undertakings at 2,000,000—7,000,000 tons in all—an economy of 10 per cent on this amount (which the committee think it fair to take as result of summer time) gives about 60,000 tons over one month, 200,000 tons over three and one-half months (length of summer-time period in France in 1916), 360,000 tons over six months, 410,000 tons over seven months.

If a 15 per cent economy is reckoned, the savings are estimated at about 87,500 tons over one month, 306,000 tons over three and one-half months, 525,000 tons over six months, 612,000 tons over seven months.

Reckoning a mean between these two calculations the saving over six months is put at 442,500 tons and over seven months at 511,000 tons; representing a saving in cost (estimating £1,750,000) and 51,000,000 (£2,030,000), respectively; "chiffres moyens qui pourraient approcher davantage de la verite."

2. The director of inventions affecting the national defense after studying figures of output of gas during the periods preceding and following the introduction of summer time and the restoration of normal time concluded that the saving in coal or gas light might be put at 1 kilogram (somewhat over 2 pounds) per person, or 1 ton for each 1,000 persons per month.

There are said to be 18,000,000 persons in France "eclaires par le gaz," so that the economy of coal on this basis would amount to 18,000 tons per month, or more than 200,000 over the whole year.

The figure for electricity undertakings is estimated as 100,000, giving a total of 300,000 tons (30,000,000 francs, or £1,190,000) for gas and electricity combined. Half this amount would be saved for the summer-time period.

3. At the Calais docks there was an increase in unloading capacity of 250 tons each day of summer.

4. At Marseilles it was found possible to deal with an extra quantity of goods estimated at between 12,000 and 31,000 tons from July to September (2½ per cent to 4 per cent of the total tonnage unloaded).

#### GERMANY.

The municipal gas works at Berlin reported a decrease during May and June, 1916, of 598,500 cubic meters in spite of the fact that 18,000 new gas meters were put up during the first six months of 1916, and the records from January to April showed an increase of 2.4 million cubic meters output of gas as compared with 1915.

The other countries of Europe are investigating the results of last year's operation of the daylight-saving plan. (Report English Commission, p. 17.)

### III. Daylight saving as a war measure in the United States.

#### A. THE FOOD PROBLEM.

1. This country is facing a very serious food problem the solution of which, in part at least, lies in increased, intensive cultivation of the soil. Most agricultural operations must cease at sunset.

2. The daylight-saving plan offers opportunity to over 20,000,000 workers engaged in trade, transportation, and other pursuits outside the field of agriculture for an extra hour of daylight after their workday is over for work on the land.

The United States Food Administrator, Mr. Herbert C. Hoover, writing on February 2, 1918, says:

"In the coming spring and summer the additional food production which the Government is desirous of securing will be very largely stimulated by the additional daylight which will be given to those town workers whose interest in gardening and whose production are of great interest to the Government."

Prof. V. N. Carver, Harvard University, and former Chief of the Rural Organization Service of the United States Government, says:

"It would be a great help to the movement for the increase of the production of food if workmen had an extra hour of daylight in the evening for work in their gardens. An hour's work a day in a garden, if wisely directed, will produce an amazing amount of food."

"I believe this to be of the utmost importance. Unless something unforeseen happens, the world is going to experience the greatest food shortage within the next year that it has known since the Napoleonic wars. The chances are that there will be many hungry people in our large cities before another winter is over, not because there is not enough work for them to do, not because money wages will not be high, but because food will be hard to get at any price. Anything which will enable workmen to produce a part of their own food is, therefore, of the utmost importance."

#### B. CONSERVATION OF COAL AND OTHER MATERIAL RESOURCES.

1. There is no doubt but that this country will achieve the savings that the European nations have experienced.

In Section IV of this statement will be found a very conservative estimate of the savings in coal which may be expected from daylight saving.

#### IV. Fuel saving to be expected from daylight saving.

If daylight saving were adopted in the United States through act of Congress a very important saving in consumption of fuel, especially of coal, would result. What the total saving of coal would be is very difficult to estimate, but it would apparently exceed 1,500,000 tons a year, even if daylight saving were in effect only for the shortest period that has been suggested and at a time of year when there is least need for artificial heat and light. The saving would occur in both direct and indirect ways.

#### DIRECT SAVING.

Daylight saving contemplates increased utilization of natural light through better adjustment of the active day for the greater part of the population to the hours during which artificial light is not generally required. Coal enters into artificial light mainly through development of electric energy and through production of gas, both by carbonization and in use under boilers and retorts.

The amount of coal that will be saved if the clock is moved ahead one hour will differ with the period during which this method of daylight saving is used. Calculations computed for different periods, based upon actual British experience in the summer of 1916, and modified by allowances for differences in latitude, etc., give the following savings in coal for the United States:

(1) Saving of 150 hours of a yearly average of 1,320 per year requiring artificial illumination in the United States (i. e., by daylight saving between second Sunday in April and last Sunday in September, according to the Calder bill (S. 1854) now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce):

	Tons coal.
In electricity for lighting	660,000
In gas for lighting	144,000
	804,000

(2) Saving of 190 hours from the yearly average (i. e., with clocks moved ahead 1 hour between Apr. 1 and Nov. 30):

	Tons coal.
In electricity for lighting	836,000
In gas for lighting	183,300
	1,019,000

(3) Saving of 198 hours from the yearly average (i. e., with clocks advanced 1 hour throughout year):

	Tons coal.
In electricity for lighting	871,000
In gas for lighting	190,000
	1,061,000

The saving in coal used for these purposes could be represented approximately by the following percentages:

(1) With saving of 150 hours:	
Amount of coal used for lighting through gas and electricity, approximately	tons 15,750,000
Amount saved	do 804,000
Percentage saved	5

(2) With saving of 190 hours:	
Amount of coal used for lighting through gas and electricity, approximately	tons 15,750,000
Amount saved	do 1,019,000
Percentage saved	6.5

(3) With saving of 198 hours:	
Amount of coal used for lighting through gas and electricity, approximately	tons 15,750,000
Amount saved	do 1,061,000
Percentage saved	6.6

#### THESE ESTIMATES CONSERVATIVE.

Any estimate for the whole territory of the United States, such as has been made above, must proceed upon many assumptions and estimates. That the estimates which are presented are conservative appears from several circumstances. For instance, actual British experience in the summer of 1916 demonstrated that the electric current used during the period of daylight saving was reduced by percentages that ranged from 14 to 55, and the amount of gas used was reduced by percentages as low as 2 but as high as 26. The figures do not include the savings in coal which would be obtained at "isolated" plants and at the plants of electric railways which sell power for lighting. Again, the estimate has been made on a basis which assumes that the use of electric energy and gas for lighting is spread evenly over the country, whereas, as a matter of fact, the census report for 1912 showed that out of a total of 70,000,000 incandescent lights wired for service by municipal and commercial central stations 57,000,000 were in the New



England, Middle Atlantic, and North Central States; in other words, were in the part of the country where, because of latitude, the advantages of daylight saving will be most striking.

The estimate for the results if daylight saving is used throughout the year is especially conservative, since it includes no estimate for the saving which would result throughout two winter months, when, in effect, a morning hour with very moderate use of artificial light would be substituted for an evening hour of maximum artificial illumination. The saving of coal obtained in this way can not be estimated very accurately, but it apparently would exceed 300,000 tons.

#### INDIRECT SAVING.

The saving of coal through substitution of a morning hour of moderate artificial illumination for an evening hour of maximum use of electricity and gas for lights illustrates ways in which very important savings in coal would be obtained.

Reduction of the peak load for central power stations would have very important results. To illustrate the importance of this item the situation of the Commonwealth Edison Co., of Chicago, which distributes approximately one-eighth of the country's total electric energy, may be taken. The peak load of this company is needed for no more than one and one-half hours a day. The average load is less than 50 per cent of the peak. The investment in equipment to produce the peak is upward of one-fourth of the whole and equals at least \$25,000,000; the cost of carrying this equipment is \$3,250,000 a year. At Rochester, N. Y., one-third of the investment is said to be necessary to care for the peak, at a cost per customer per year of \$60. Daylight saving would flatten the peak, since at the seasons when the yearly peak is now attained (because the greatest demand for electric transportation and the maximum use of electric light come at the same hour) daylight saving would reduce the requirements of power for lighting and would at the same time place the greatest demand for electric transportation further within the hours of natural light; in other words, daylight saving would tend to separate the two factors the concurrence of which now causes great investment and large use of coal, and at the same time would materially reduce one of those factors. The benefits would be twofold—(1) saving of coal in an amount which can not be accurately estimated, but which would reach into the hundreds of thousands of tons, and (2) postponement of new investments in equipment to carry the peak of the load.

This postponement of new investments will occur at a time when it is of the highest public interest to avoid all new financing of private enterprise that is possible. The new investment otherwise necessary may again be illustrated through the situation of the Commonwealth Edison Co. In 1916 it had a generating capacity of 360,000 kilowatts, at the end of 1917 it had increased this to 452,000, and according to plans made in 1917 it will have raised it to 600,000 by the end of 1919.

In the use of coal for domestic purposes daylight saving, if practiced during eight or more months, will cause real economies, although there are such great diversities in this use that the saving of coal can not be estimated very accurately. The saving would occur during the cooler months when, in effect, a morning hour when relatively little heat is used in residences would be substituted for an evening hour when under present conditions the use of artificial heat in residences is at its maximum. That the saving would be considerable is apparent from the fact that, according to the figures of the Geological Survey for 1915, at least 60,000,000 tons of bituminous coal will be used this year for heating residences.

Daylight saving will have its effect, too, upon some other problems regarding coal. For example, it will make it easier to persuade small electric stations throughout the country to decrease their "all-night" service and save coal proportionately. It would create a public sentiment which would insist upon needless lighting by municipalities being eliminated, and would lead each private user of electric lights to reduce the amount of light he uses to his actual requirements, thus reducing extravagance in electric energy. The public point of view created by daylight saving will make easier adjustment of such question as the legitimacy under present conditions of advertising by electric signs, illumination of "white ways," etc.

#### V. Support of daylight saving.

Daylight saving, to be made uniformly effective throughout the continental United States by act of Congress, is actively supported by the following officers and organizations:

The President of the United States.  
United States Food Administrator, Mr. Herbert C. Hoover.  
United States Fuel Administrator, Dr. Harry A. Garfield.  
The Chairman of the United States Shipping Board, Mr. E. N. Hurley.  
Conference of shipyard employment managers, called by the United States Shipping Board.  
The Council of National Defense.  
The advisory commission, Council of National Defense.  
Committee on coal production, Council of National Defense.  
The following State councils of defense: Arizona Council of Defense; Connecticut Committee on Public Safety; Illinois Council of Defense; Iowa Council of Defense; Maine Committee on Public Safety; Nebraska Council of Defense; New Hampshire Committee on Public Safety; New Jersey Committee on Public Safety; Rhode Island Committee on Public Safety; South Dakota Council of Defense; Vermont Committee on Public Safety.

Pennsylvania Legislature, by joint resolution memorializing Congress.  
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.  
American Federation of Labor.  
Board of Managers, New York Cotton Exchange.  
State Board of Agriculture, Massachusetts.  
State Board of Education, New Jersey.  
Boston School Committee, Boston, Mass.  
American Philosophical Society.  
American Association for the Advancement of Science.  
National Lawn Tennis Association.  
National Baseball League.

In addition to action taken through membership in the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, many commercial and other similar organizations have taken special action. These organizations include:

Traffic Club of New England.  
York Chamber of Commerce, York, Pa.  
Commercial Club, Dayenport, Iowa.  
Merchants and Manufacturers Association, Milwaukee, Wis.  
Chamber of Commerce, Franklin, Ind.  
Johnson County Business Men's Association, Franklin, Ind.  
Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.  
Chicago Association of Commerce.  
Civic and Commercial Association, Denver, Colo.  
Duluth Commercial Club, Duluth, Minn.  
Portland Rotary Club, Portland, Me.

Portland Retail Merchants' Association (Maine).  
Portland Cement Association, Chicago, Ill.  
Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, Indianapolis, Ind.  
Fall River Chamber of Commerce, Fall River, Mass.  
Great Dayton Association, Chicago, Ill.  
Worcester Chamber of Commerce, Worcester, Mass.  
Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.  
Rochester Chamber of Commerce, Rochester.  
Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, Charlotte, N. C.  
Manchester Board of Commerce, Manchester, N. H.  
Greenbay Association of Commerce, Greenbay, Wis.  
Muskegon Chamber of Commerce, Muskegon, Mich.  
Waterloo Commercial Club, Waterloo, Iowa.  
Dubois Chamber of Commerce, Dubois, Pa.  
Greenville Chamber of Commerce, Greenville, S. C.  
Retail Lumber Dealers of State of New York.  
Pittsfield Board of Trade, Pittsfield, Mass.  
Council Bluffs Chamber of Commerce, Council Bluffs, Iowa.  
Spokane Chamber of Commerce, Spokane, Wash.  
Chariton Commercial Club, Chariton, Iowa.  
City Commission, Grand Rapids, Mich.  
Jamestown Board of Commerce, Jamestown, N. Y.  
Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
Middletown Chamber of Commerce, Middletown, Ohio.  
Merchants' Association, Springfield, Ohio.  
State Chamber of Commerce, Pennsylvania.

A. LINCOLN FILENE,  
Chairman Executive Committee on Daylight Saving  
of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and committee amendments to final passage.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The rule which was adopted by the committee provided for the consideration to Senate bill 1854 under the general rules of the House. This bill that is presented for consideration contains several committee amendments. Those amendments have not been presented as yet for action by any Member of the House. It is the general rule, if I am not mistaken, that a bill when presented to the House by a report is considered as it is introduced and requires some formal action on the part of some Member of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. What is the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STAFFORD. My inquiry is whether it is not necessary for the gentleman to move to amend as his committee directed him?

The SPEAKER. No. The universal practice is if the bill is read and the amendments are read they are supposed to be pending. I do not remember during the whole time I have been here to have ever seen it done in any other way. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 4, strike out the word "April" and insert the word "March."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 6, strike out the word "September" and insert the word "October."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, strike out the word "April" and insert the word "March."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 11, strike out the word "September" and insert the word "October."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 24 and 25, strike out section 5.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 1, strike out the figure "6" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "5."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. The previous question having been ordered, that shuts off all amendments except the committee amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes; all debate.

Mr. WINGO. No amendment would be in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. No. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 253, nays 40, answered "present" 6, not voting 133, as follows:

## YEAS—253.

Alexander	Fairfield	Lehlbach	Robinson
Anderson	Farr	Lever	Rogers
Ashbrook	Ferris	Linthicum	Rose
Ayres	Fess	Little	Rouse
Baer	Fisher	Littlepage	Rowe
Bankhead	Flood	Loneragan	Rubey
Barkley	Focht	Longworth	Russell
Barnhart	Fordney	Lufkin	Sabath
Beakes	Foster	Lundeen	Sanders, La.
Black	Frear	McAndrews	Sanders, N. Y.
Bland	Freeman	McArthur	Sanford
Blanton	French	McClintic	Saunders, Va.
Borland	Fuller, Ill.	McFadden	Scott, Iowa
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	McKinley	Scott, Mich.
Britten	Gallagher	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sells
Browne	Gandy	Madden	Shackelford
Browning	Gard	Magee	Sherry
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tenn.	Maher	Sims
Buchanan	Glass	Mansfield	Sinnot
Burroughs	Glynn	Mapes	Sloan
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Martin	Small
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodall	Mason	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Kans.	Gould	Mays	Smith, Mich.
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	Meeker	Smith, C. B.
Carlin	Green, Iowa	Miller, Minn.	Snook
Carter, Okla.	Greene, Mass.	Miller, Wash.	Stafford
Cary	Griest	Mondell	Stedman
Classon	Hadley	Moon	Steele
Claypool	Hamilton, Mich.	Moore, Pa.	Sterling, Ill.
Cleary	Hamlin	Moore, Ind.	Stiness
Coady	Harrison, Miss.	Morgan	Strong
Collier	Haskell	Mott	Sumners
Connally, Tex.	Hastings	Neely	Sweet
Cooper, Ohio	Haugen	Nelson	Swift
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayden	Nolan	Tague
Cooper, Wis.	Helm	Oldfield	Temple
Cox	Hensley	Oliver, N. Y.	Thompson
Crosser	Hersey	Olney	Tillman
Dale, N. Y.	Hicks	Osborne	Timberlake
Dale, Vt.	Hilliard	O'Shaunessy	Towner
Dallinger	Holland	Overmyer	Van Dyke
Decker	Houston	Padgett	Venable
Dempsey	Howard	Palge	Voigt
Denison	Hull, Tenn.	Park	Waldow
Denton	Humphreys	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Dewalt	Igoe	Parker, N. Y.	Walton
Dickinson	Ireland	Peters	Wason
Dill	Johnson, Wash.	Phelan	Watkins
Dillon	Jones, Tex.	Platt	Watson, Pa.
Dixon	Jones, Va.	Polk	Welty
Doelling	Juhl	Pratt	Whaley
Doollittle	Kearns	Purnell	Wheeler
Doremus	Keating	Ralney	White, Me.
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Raker	Wilson, Ill.
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramsey	Wilson, Tex.
Dupré	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramseyer	Winslow
Dyer	Kettner	Randall	Wood, Ind.
Eagan	Kless, Pa.	Rankin	Woods, Iowa
Elliot	Kinkaid	Rayburn	Young, N. Dak.
Ellsworth	Kitchin	Reavis	Young, Tex.
Elston	Knutson	Reed	Zihlman
Emerson	Kreider	Riordan	
Esch	Langley	Robbins	
Evans	Larsen	Roberts	

## NAYS—40.

Almon	Dominick	Lee, Ga.	Stephens, Miss.
Bell	Garner	Lobeck	Stevenson
Blackmon	Goodwin, Ark.	McCulloch	Taylor, Ark.
Brand	Gray, Ala.	McLemore	Taylor, Colo.
Burnett	Hawley	Oliver, Ala.	Thomas
Candler, Miss.	Hedlin	Overstreet	Vinson
Caraway	Huddleston	Price	Weaver
Connolly, Kans.	Johnson, Ky.	Romjue	Williams
Cramton	Kincheloe	Sisson	Wingo
Crisp	Lea, Cal.	Stegall	Wright

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Booher	Hardy	London	Snell
Cannon	King		

## NOT VOTING—134.

Anthony	Capstick	Costello	Dies
Aswell	Carew	Crago	Donovan
Austin	Carter, Mass.	Currie, Mich.	Drane
Bacharach	Chandler, N. Y.	Curry, Cal.	Drukker
Beshlin	Chandler, Okla.	Darrow	Dunn
Brodbeck	Church	Davidson	Eagle
Butler	Clark, Fla.	Davis	Edmonds
Caldwell	Clark, Pa.	Delaney	Estopinal
Campbell, Pa.	Copley	Dent	Fairchild, B. L.

Fairchild, G. W.	Hull, Iowa	Mudd	Steenerson
Fields	Husted	Nicholls, S. C.	Stephens, Nebr.
Flynn	Hutchinson	Nichols, Mich.	Sterling, Pa.
Foss	Jacoway	Norton	Sullivan
Francis	James	Porter	Switzer
Gallivan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pou	Talbot
Garland	Kahn	Powers	Templeton
Garrett, Tex.	Kehoe	Quin	Tilson
Gillett	Kelley, Mich.	Ragsdale	Tinkham
Good	Key, Ohio	Rodenberg	Treadway
Gordon	Kraus	Rowland	Vare
Graham, Pa.	La Follette	Rucker	Vestal
Gray, N. J.	LaGuardia	Sanders, Ind.	Volstead
Greene, Vt.	Lazaro	Schall	Walker
Gregg	Lenroot	Scott, Pa.	Ward
Griffin	Leshner	Scully	Watson, Va.
Hamill	Lunn	Sears	Webb
Hamilton, N. Y.	McCormick	Shallenberger	Welling
Harrison, Va.	McKenzie	Sherwood	White, Ohio
Hayes	McKeown	Shouse	Wilson, La.
Heaton	McLaughlin, Pa.	Siegel	Wise
Heintz	Mann	Slayden	Woodyard
Helvering	Merritt	Slemp	
Hollingsworth	Montague	Smith, T. F.	
Hood	Morin	Snyder	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. KEHOE with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. GILLET.

Mr. HOOD with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. BACHARACH.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

Mr. DELANEY with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.

Mr. McKEOWN with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. BESHLIN with Mr. WARD.

Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. DENT with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. CHURCH with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.

Mr. DIES with Mr. FOSS.

Mr. HELVERING with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. GARLAND.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. DARROW.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.

Mr. DRANE with Mr. FRANCIS.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. LARSEN with Mr. GOOD.

Mr. EAGLE with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. LAZARO with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LESHNER with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. HEATON.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. GORDON with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. LUNN with Mr. SIEGEL.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. POU with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. QUIN with Mr. HULL of Iowa.

Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. STEENERSON.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. TEMPLETON.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER with Mr. TILSON.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. CURRY of California.

Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. WELLING with Mr. JAMES.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. VARE.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. VOLSTEAD.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. LA FOLLETTE.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. WOODYARD.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

On motion of Mr. SIMS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.



MRS. ANNIE BAILEY.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, when the House resolution No. 259 was passed, inadvertently an amendment to the resolution, which should have been adopted, was omitted, and I ask that the action of the House in passing the resolution be vacated.

The SPEAKER. In passing the House resolution 259 there was a small amendment left out, and the gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which it was passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: After the word "pay," in line 2 of the resolution, insert the words "out of the contingent fund of the House."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who have spoken on the so-called Borland amendment may have leave to extend their remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that gentlemen who have spoken on the Borland amendment to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill be permitted to extend their remarks on the bill itself and the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the daylight-saving bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the daylight-saving bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the daylight-saving bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing an article in the Atlanta Constitution on the Speaker's birthday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to print an editorial about the proceedings on the Speaker's birthday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## DAYLIGHT-SAVING BILL.

Mr. WALDOW. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. FRANCIS, was unable to be here. Had he been here he would have voted "aye" on the daylight-saving bill.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. I rise to submit an inquiry of an astronomical nature. The rules of the House provide that we should meet at 12 o'clock meridian. If the daylight-saving bill becomes a law at what hour would the House convene? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. It would be 12 o'clock by the clock.

Mr. WALSH. But it would not be 12 o'clock meridian.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows, but the rule provides that the House meet at 12 by the clock.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 16, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of Agriculture submitting an estimate of appropriation to enable the Department of Agriculture to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products (H. Doc. No. 975), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10587) granting to the city of San Diego certain lands in the Cleveland National Forest and the Capitan Grande Indian Reservation for dam and reservoir purposes for the conservation of water, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 381), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10589) to make valid certain certificates of naturalization, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 382), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PRICE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4610) to compensate Thomas G. Allen for injuries received while employed in the General Land Office of the United States, and making an appropriation therefor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 384), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEAGALL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1012) for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Crawford, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 385), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 10744) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department, approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 10745) to authorize Cole and Osage Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across the Osage River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10746) to provide for a monument at Arlington to mark the grave of Maj. Gen. William S. Rosecrans; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 10747) providing for the better administration of justice in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 10748) to repeal section 896 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10749) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, to grant in his discretion, leave of absence to certain employees outside of the city of Washington; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10750) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the extension eastwardly of the Columbia Railway," approved June 13, 1898, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RUBEY: Resolution (H. Res. 281) for the immediate consideration of a bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture as a substitute for H. R. 7795; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 10751) granting an increase of pension to William B. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10752) granting an increase of pension to William Froats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10753) to amend House bill 1339, Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 10754) granting an increase of pension to Eli Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 10755) granting a pension to Anna Fishbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 10756) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Hand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE of New York: A bill (H. R. 10757) for the relief of Swend A. Swendson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 10758) granting a pension to Emma Bridgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 10759) for the relief of Otho Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10760) granting an increase of pension to John Jarrette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10761) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10762) granting an increase of pension to Bennett W. Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10763) granting an increase of pension to John M. Tyree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10764) granting an increase of pension to Stephen F. Easterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10765) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10766) granting a pension to Thomas Gentry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10767) granting an increase of pension to Frank H. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10768) for the relief of George W. Gamble; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10769) granting a pension to Joseph B. Doan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10770) granting an increase of pension to William J. Robey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 10771) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Searls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10772) to establish the military record of James W. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 10773) granting a pension to Fritz Hintermeyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 10774) granting a pension to Eugene Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 10775) granting an increase of pension to Albert Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 10776) for the relief of Charles B. Carroll; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 10777) granting a pension to Joseph Heming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10778) granting a pension to Henry A. Jaegle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 10779) granting an increase of pension to James Custer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALTON: A bill (H. R. 10780) granting a pension to Alvin R. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 10781) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Irish Women's Council, asking for the recognition of the political independence in the form of the Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of National Retail Dry Goods Association, relative to payment of the income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Barnet, Vt., favoring national prohibition during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolutions of the Market Street Business Men's Association and Walnut Street Business Men's Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., in behalf of daylight saving; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of members of the Irish Women's Council of New York City, Philadelphia, Springfield, and San Francisco, and others, relative to freedom for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of State of New York, relative to payment of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of the Belvidere (Ill.) Screw & Machine Co.; the Mechanics Machine Co. of Rockford, Ill.; and Adolph Lewishon, of New York, asking that provision be made for the payment of war taxes in quarterly installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Resolution of the Michigan State Grange, protesting against any proposition to discontinue or curtail Rural Free Delivery Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Resolutions adopted by the Illinois Firemen's Association, protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Louisa Fishburn, Hortense S. Cramer, Clifford C. Cable, J. R. Sutton, M. F. Ralston, Laura S. Gilbert, and 15 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cora Louther White, J. W. McCaslin, W. B. Rankin, Addie B. Wastfeld, William Robertson, Mrs. J. A. McCulloch, and 30 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. D. W. Coulter, H. H. Hyde, Mrs. H. H. Hyde, Miss Marjorie Hyde, Mrs. Mary C. Miller, and Mrs. George W. Hagerman, all of Oak Creek, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs, protesting against increased postage rates on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Council of Providence (R. I.) Engineering Society, favoring passage of daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Eugene Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Philadelphia Bourse, favoring action upon Senate bill 3530, providing for the repeal of the act of March 1, 1913, authorizing the valuation of the physical property of the carriers; also another resolution of the same body, requesting action on the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSE: Petition of A. B. Gordon and others, residents of Bedford County, Pa., for the repeal of the zone rate, and for making the second-class postage rate one and the same, level and uniform throughout the Union, regardless of distance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Presbyterian Church, Juniata, Pa., for the enactment, in the shortest time possible, national prohibition as a military necessity; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ROUSE: Resolution of the Newport Lodge, No. 5, of Kentucky, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of America, asking for immediate action for operation and maintenance of adequate navigation facilities for the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Protest of Thomas G. Phillips and 35 citizens of Olivet, against zone system second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of Seventh-day Adventist Church, Battle Creek, protesting against Sunday laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of John C. Winans and 50 citizens, of Waldron, against zone system second-class postal matters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of Advance Pump & Compressor Co., Union Steam Pump Co., and Rathbun & Kraft, all of Battle Creek, against absolute and final rate-fixing power on Director General of Railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protest of Bryant Paper Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., against absolute and final rate-fixing power being conferred on Director General of Railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Lumbermen's Exchange of Philadelphia, in support of four-payment plan for excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Market Street, Walnut Street, and Chestnut Street Business Men's Associations, of Philadelphia, asking immediate action on the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Pittsburgh Newspaper Publishers' Association, asking for the recoinage of the 2-cent piece; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.